940.28
Poa/EUR
27474

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 02 January, 2016

EUROPE AND AMERICA,

IN 1821;

2 2 0 14

WITH AN

EXAMINATION OF THE PLAN LAID BEFORE THE CORTES OF SPAIN,

FOR THE

RECOGNITION OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF SOUTH AMERICA.

27474 aC

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH OF

THE ABBÉ DE PRADT,

BY

J. D. WILLIAMS.

VOL. I.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR G. COWIE & CO. 31, POULTRY.

1822.

940:28
Pro/Eur
27474
00027474

PREFACE.

THE present Work is a continuation of one that appeared under a similar title at the commencement of the year 1821, and is a review of that year, so fertile in extraordinary events. Judging from the aspect of the one that succeeds it, we have every reason to expect that *it* will also not prove sterile in grand and decisive actions. The new year, rising from out the fires that already blaze in many places, and which are bursting forth in many more, threatens to change the political horizon into a torrid zone, the temperature of which will equal that of the period, that has just passed.

In reviews of this nature, in which it is necessary to comprise all the important occurrences of a year within a small compass, the mind is freed from the superfluity of events of minor importance, and is fixed upon the substantial part of history; this is the real and indispensable knowledge of the

spirit of the times, beyond which it is impossible to have clear conceptions.

The necessity of pursuing this course is shewn by the aversion for general considerations, which appears to become universal, and by the preference which is exclusively given to *personality* and to private details; it might be supposed that minds become contracted as the scene increases in extent. The transactions in Mexico form the most important event that has occurred in this and many centuries, and yet it has attracted less attention than the removal of a prefect, or of the chief of a ministerial division; for who is there that casts a glance at, or bestows a moment's attention upon America? One might suppose that she did not exist, or that she were a mere *bagatelle*, as La-fontaine says. There are not four persons to be found in Paris, who turn a thought upon America. The same system has been adopted in this Work that was pursued in the last, and it will be found, that it commences by clearly ascertaining the moral and political state of Europe, by shewing the seat of Power, and the hands that guide it, by discovering the general agent of the universal impulse, which is civilisation, and by dissipating those erroneous notions, a most fatal use of which has been made to mislead many

minds; it then passes from these preliminaries to the analysis of the events which have taken place in each particular State; this method has appeared the most natural and most conducive to the proper elucidation of the question. Obscurity cannot be completely banished from a general narrative that embraces many subjects; confusion can only be avoided in a gallery of pictures, by separating and placing them at proper distances.

The basis of this world was laid on the State of the world itself; it has been labouring at a reformation of its Institutions, and this consideration was of itself sufficient to sketch out the plan of the Work; it shewed that it was absolutely necessary to follow the course of the world, and to prove whether it advanced or receded in the career it had chosen. There certainly is not a more magnificent spectacle, than that of a world regenerating itself, revising all its institutions, separating the fundamental and salutary work of nature, from the casual and disordered work of man, those of enlightened minds from those of barbarism, and applying to the improvement of societies, the seeds sown, during many ages, by all the geniuses that have done honor to human nature. What a consoling perspective would this offer to the heart of man, if the passions did not oppose the

majestic course which the universe has taken! This combat is every where perceptible: nations and individuals alike feel its influence. It is thus that Austria required that Italy should be effeminate, parcelled out, and in a state of nullity, while it was necessary, while Europe, Italy herself, and the human intellect required, that she should be concentrated, and should assume a manly attitude; and thus the human species requires, that intelligence should shine in all the fulness of its lustre, whilst its obscurity is requisite to the support of the empire of aristocracy. It is also thus that Europe is, at this moment, placed between two resplendent beacons, Greece and America, and that she appears more obscured than enlightened or influenced by these two brilliant lights, the unexpected appearance of which is unpleasant to some persons. The division of Europe into two zones of sociability, which are opposed to each other, and which renders all common language between the two parties, as well as with America, impossible, is a new trait in history, and forms the distinctive character of our age. The attention of the reader will be often called to it in this work, because it is impossible, without this knowledge, to obtain a correct idea of the events that are occurring in

the world. The natural order of this work has thus made it one of the principles, and as it is destined to the strengthening of constitutional liberty, and to the explanation of questions which may accelerate its enjoyment and incontested establishment, it appertains entirely to social theories, to truth, and to impartiality, on which foundations the first are laid. I trust that the reader may discover this sentiment in the union of candour with respect, of truth with decorum and *respect of persons*, which has been religiously observed. Instruction is not founded on the irritation of the mind, but on its pacification, and hearts, which are calm, are most open to persuasion.*

* I request that this spirit of conciliation and pacification may preside over the interpretation of every thing that may have escaped in a work which was, of necessity, hastily composed. An impartial judge is always inclined to interpret *in mitius*. It is in this spirit that the expression of "country of evil fame," that will be found in the chapter on the death of Napoleon, should be considered; it only refers to a common opinion, which has been founded upon actions, that are to be attributed only to the manners of the least civilised portion of the inhabitants of that country. Not a single act or general qualification has been heard. The population of Corsica is known to resemble that of other civilised countries, and that it has presented France with men of great distinction in several professions. No one can have the right of inculpating a whole country or a whole population.

The consummation of a great destiny has been accomplished during this year, and in a region far distant from that over which it spread its brilliancy. Napoleon has ceased to exist! This is a sorrowful and instructive lesson to all human attachments. The silence of his tomb has been spread over all that his magnificence had rendered so brilliant; Africa was not more mute than France herself.* A few children only have been seen playing with the bones of the giant, and have thus indiscreetly exposed themselves to the arms of justice. This has been seen to yield to a few insignificant schoolboys in a struggle as insignificant, and in this unequal, and melancholy, although ridiculous, contest, all of solemnity and decorum have been forgotten; yet solemnity was never more requisite than in this instance. History alone having any right to claim, and gratitude alone having duties to perform towards a memory, that must be placed beyond the sphere of the passions, endeavors should have been made to prepare that place in history which justice assigns to it

* In the course of the singular prosecutions so wisely instituted against scholars, who were the authors of a few pages on the death of Napoleon and the existence of which was not suspected by any one, the solicitors general were heard to exclaim against the number of writings that had been produced by that event; but after all that has happened, it appears that the cause for surprise was not in the large, but the small number of them.

and which concerns the honor of so many millions of men, who served him with enthusiasm. No, France could not long submit to any one that was unworthy of her, nor could Europe pay homage to an empty name. Such deceptions and fascinations are unnatural, and are soon discovered and dissipated; this is all that was attempted to be proved in the article relating to Napoleon. May it be looked upon as an example of the concentration of all duties and of the manner in which they may be fulfilled, by reconciling even opposing obligations with that dignity which belongs to one of the grandest subjects ever furnished to history.

In addition to other reasons which induce the author to hope for the indulgence of the public, one may be added, which seems to insure him this favour, viz. the shortness of the time, in which he had to complete a work of this extent; the world was his subject, and a few weeks the poor remains of the year that was hurring on, and of which he had to present a picture, was the only time allowed him; a longer delay would have been fatal; there must also be taken into consideration, the difficulty of writing in the midst of contentions which inflame the passions, of the weariness of indifference,

of the insults of ignorance, of the snares of politics, and of party spirit armed with power, which is often, if not unscrupulous, at least, ungenerous in its application; an estimate may then be made of the solidity of that attachment to the public interest, which is able to overcome so many motives for declining the task of undertaking, and carrying on its defence.

CONTENTS

VOL. I.

PAGE

CHAP. I.

Political state of Europe in general. Statistics of European Powers 2

CHAP. II.

Moral statistics of Europe in general 22

CHAP. III.

The Holy Alliance and the Quintuple Alliance 29

CHAP. IV.

Pacific disposition of Europe, in 1821 46

CHAP. V.

Constitutional Spirit, in 1821 56

CHAP. VI.

Of Civilisation and its power 67

CHAP. VII.

Seat of the European Power; their mode of proceeding 97

CHAP. VIII.

Non-conforming Europe. Provisional Europe. Perplexity of the Europeans 113

CHAP. IX.

Method of Extrication 131

CHAP. X.

Has the Constitutional System retrograded in 1821?..... 135

CHAP. XI.

That all the present questions relate to the Social Contract. Sovereignty of the people; signification of this word... 146

CHAP. XII.

Necessity of determining the question of the Social Contract..... 160

CHAP. XIII.

Recapitulation..... 171

CHAP. XIV.

Italy.—Congresses of Troppau and Laybach.—Naples.... 176

CHAP. XV.

Spain and Portugal..... 359

EUROPE AND AMERICA,

IN 1821.

CHAP. I.

POLITICAL STATE OF EUROPE IN GENERAL. STATISTICS OF EUROPEAN POWERS.

As the Congress of Vienna forms the true epoch of the present politics of Europe, and the period from which they may date their rise, it naturally presents itself as the most eligible point from which to commence our observations. By adjudging Poland to Russia, and Italy to Austria; by dividing Prussia, and placing the third part of this power on the frontiers of France, that Congress has destroyed, if not for ever, at least for many ages, the political balance of Europe. Every species of inexpediency is to be found in such a distribution of power, and, perhaps, the greatest is its little susceptibility of change or improve-

ment. It is this difficulty of correcting the errors of original institutions, which should enforce the necessity of being circumspect in their formation; for, once formed, their amendment can only be effected by a long lapse of time, by the most persevering efforts and a ruinous expenditure, or by a happy combination of extraordinary circumstances, such as, in the last century, the succession of Spain in 1701; that of Maria Theresa in 1740; and still more recently, the French Revolution in 1789.

The two former events were the means of frustrating the ambitious measures of Charles V. under the weight of which Europe had struggled during two centuries. The continental influence of Spain was destroyed by her losing Naples, the Milanese, and the Low Countries; and thus detached and isolated, she became an American rather than an European Power. Austria, on her side, forced to abandon Naples and Silesia, at the same time that she repossessed herself of Italy, laid in Germany the foundation of a kingdom, destined to balance her own weight in the heart of the empire, and to establish in the North, a military power of the first class. From the twenty years' war of the Revolution, have arisen the kingdom of Hol-

land, the incorporation of Venice with Austria, of Genoa with Piedmont, the reunion of Sweden with Norway, of Finland and Poland with Russia: a gigantic step in the politics of Europe! for, by placing this latter Power at her very gates, Europe has delivered to her the keys of them. The parallels furnished by events such as these, are but few, nor will even these admit of being applied to the actual state of the Continent, which has now assumed a form no longer doubtful and undecided. On whichever side we turn, nothing is to be perceived, from which the least reform or important change can be expected, for, let us examine attentively, and say, whether the intimate connection of the great Powers among themselves does not exclude all possibility of their encroachment upon one another: could Prussia or Austria, for example, attack Russia? or would Russia, on her part, permit Austria to make any aggressions upon Prussia? and so of all the other States.

In the existing constitution of things, the first movement of any great Power would unite all the others against it, by the sole instinct of self-preservation, which would sufficiently indicate to each its own ruin, in any aggressions made upon its neighbours, by a Power

already too formidable. Again, would England be permitted to make any maritime encroachments, or still more to increase her colonial riches? How, and upon whom, could France encroach? What Power would not instantly oppose her? Thus every enterprize, which should menace the actual existence of an European State, would immediately produce a general war; the bare apprehension of the effects of which will, for a long period, prevent its occurrence.

Europe will, therefore, remain as she is, in a false position, it is true, of which she will every moment feel the inconveniences; but, however constrained the attitude, still she will preserve it, from the impossibility of change; for so much are the interests, nay, even the very existence of her several States, interwoven and dependant one upon the other, that an impulse, given at one extremity of the chain, would speedily be felt at the other. Surely, this false position is, in itself, a great misfortune; but it exists, and it is impossible, and out of the nature of things, to find a remedy; the materials are wanting. In this respect, Europe is subjected to the law of necessity; the result of which is, that there can no longer exist in Europe, from want of means

to satisfy it, what is properly termed state ambition; it is, henceforth, restricted and limited to simple self-preservation. The lists are closed. No opportunity will, henceforward, present itself to the ambitious and the lovers of conquests. The present state of Europe can admit only of conservators. It is the first time that the world will have witnessed the whole of the States of a vast territory stationary at one time, the ascending progression of each terminated at the same moment, and the general movement arrested in its course, at one and the same instant, by the impossibility to which each is reduced, of proceeding a step farther.

This truth is certain, and it will be a mortifying one to those to whom it only presents a wearisome perspective *di far niente,* and to such as are still accustomed to calculate upon a state of things, which has nothing in common with that proceeding from the Congress of Vienna, and from the extinction of the great Power of France. Both classes should be induced attentively to consider the actual state of the world, and to regulate their ideas and wishes by what they observe, rather than by what they think. My duty, as I am treating of Europe, is to depict her as she is, dis-

passionately and without prejudice; and it is equally the duty of every wise man to discover the truths contained in my communications, and, after an impartial examination, to form his opinions upon whatever shall have been proved to be true. This is our common task; and may I be permitted to add, that it is essential, that sane and well-digested conclusions should be substituted for that mass of erroneous notions deduced from recollections or habits, admitted and propagated by unreflecting men; notions, from which no clear conceptions can ever be derived, and which owe their great circulation in the world to the convenience of finding ready-made ideas, that require only the trouble of repeating. This may spare labour, but cannot guarantee us from error. It is, unfortunately, but too true, that a part of that which we are accustomed, or rather condemned, to read or listen to, carries with it this character of contradiction, and even of isolation, from the actual state of the world. The real world is on one side, the fictitious on the other.

Proceeding from this point, which may be considered an elementary one, it will be found,—

1st. That the loss of the great Power of France, effected in 1812 and 1814, has shifted the balance of Power in Europe, and removed it from the western to the eastern part of that Continent; previous to which time, it was concentrated between France, the confederation of the Rhine, and Italy. Its seat then extended from the Ocean to the Elbe, and to the Saltza; it is now in the east of Europe, and extends from the Elbe to Siberia and Turkey. There, three great Powers, mutually supporting each other, and always ready, with fifteen hundred thousand bayonets, to engage in a *va-tout*, have thrown over Europe a net of iron, and opposed to it a mass, as inaccessible as immovable. This prodigious military force is the result of many ages, devoted to the severest trials of war, from the time of Peter the Great to our days; from the great Elector to Frederick William III.; and in Austria, from the time of its wars against the Turks and Louis XIV. until the prolonged contest with the several Governments of the Revolution; a laborious career, which all these Powers have persevered in with admirable constancy, not shrinking from any of the sad chances incidental to it from its very nature, and always marching, with inflexible courage, towards their proposed goal. This it is, which has conducted them to

the end of their career, and insured them that recompense which ever rewards perseverance in principles and action. Thus has been realized for them the saying of Bossuet, "In this sanguinary game, in which nations have disputed for empire, that Power which has possessed the greatest foresight and perseverance, which has continued the firmest in its great labours, in short, which has known best when to advance, or when to retreat, has finally had the advantage, and subjugated fortune to its designs."

This has been done, and has been attained by the three great Powers, which we now see holding the first rank in Europe.

Their strength developed itself in their opposition to Napoleon. The moment they united, he fell. After the battle of Leipsick, and by the Treaty of Chaumont, they were able to engage to maintain under arms, six hundred thousand men, for six years. In 1815, they furnished eight hundred thousand, of the eleven hundred thousand who were marched against France. The true strength of Europe is, henceforth, to be found in this concentrated force of the three northern Powers. It excludes every possibility of opposition.

The late occurrences in Italy prove the superiority of these nations of soldiers, over the enervated nations of citizens and mechanics. The hands accustomed only to handle the graver or the *archetto*, were easily fettered by those which forged the sabre or the pike. When the Gauls menaced Rome, that part of Italy which now forms the Papal States and the kingdom of Naples, raised six hundred thousand infantry and sixty thousand cavalry. Thus a barrier, capable of arresting its progress, was immediately raised against the torrent; but a country, consisting merely of dilettanti, must soon yield to one of weapon-bearers. The Temple of the Arts will always be subjected to that of Mars. This arises from Italy having remained stationary amidst the progress of her neighbours. The North rose in proportion as the South declined, which latter underwent the same change as the South of Germany. Italy and the southern States of Germany are destitute of any real influence over Europe. Spain and Portugal are equally impotent. Their sole weight in the balance of European Power arises from their connection with France; but for this, they would be political nonentities, and destined, as they really are, soon to lose their colonies, both of them will shortly cease to have any effective

existence in Europe. They are two States, deprived of all public importance.

2. In the elements of power of the northern States, we discover principles of strength and durability, far superior to those with which Napoleon was invested. The latter were composed of elements, forced into contact against their own inclinations, and desirous only of disuniting; this was sufficiently proved in 1813 and 1814. Italy and Holland are almost strangers to the warlike habits and occupations, which form so material a feature in the character of the northern nations. Devoted to the arts, to commerce, and to the charms of social intercourse, the former have less leisure and a smaller population, with which to supply the demands of war, than the latter, who are comparatively destitute of the arts and an extensive commerce, and who are condemned by their climate to a severe and monotonous life, without enjoyment and without pleasure.

If war be the means of despotism, as is proved by history, despotism, in its turn, is a means of war; and nations submitted to its yoke, to its harsh discipline, and severe exactions, furnish to their masters, or rather their possessors, materials for war, far more extensive

and of more easy application than those people who are governed by milder laws, and influenced by softer manners. Civilization is the means, and probably the most powerful means of peace. The greater the civilization of a nation, the greater its inclination for peace; as in private life, the greater the refinement, the less disposition is there for quarrels and disputes. A State cannot be essentially military, but when its Government is despotic; despotism, that is to say, absolute monarchy depending upon the will of one individual, is that of the three great Powers. It was that of the Convention, of the Directory, of Napoleon, three military Powers, whose despotism was derived from the army. Without the support of despotism, how could these Powers have raised, how could they maintain this military Colossus? and, without it, what could they have effected? Those losses and reverses, which would materially injure, if not ruin, the inhabitants of other countries, are scarcely felt by the subjects of the three great Powers. Had London or Paris undergone the fate of Moscow, what would have become of France or England? In Russia, the loss of Moscow was comparatively trifling; and realizing the fable of the Phœnix, it has already risen from its ashes in renovated youth and beauty.

Further, the territories of these three Powers contain, within themselves, materials for war, far exceeding those, to be found in more southern countries. Iron, wood, cattle, horses, so scarce and expensive, in the west and southern parts of Europe, abound in the north and east. Of horses, one of the principal sinews of war, the south of Europe is deprived. Had Napoleon left his cavalry in Russia, he never could have replaced it. It is with cavalry as with navies; the loss of which, in some countries, can never be repaired. Louis XIV. could never replace his. Every thing, therefore, conspires to constitute, among these three Powers, a consolidation of force unequalled.

This all-powerful coalition cannot, however, alter its own nature, nor conquer its natural inclination to power. It has imposed upon Europe a dictatorship, not indeed one which dethrones and disinherits, like Napoleon's, but one which rules with a far more powerful supremacy; which, while it does not openly promulgate its imperious decrees, enforces obedience by such irresistible combinations, as totally destroy individual opinion. Whatever may be the appearance in all public and official affairs, as well as in prescribed forms, the ground-work of a dictatorship exists under the

cloak of liberty; to be convinced of this, it is only necessary to observe the parts played by secondary States. I will go farther, I will say by all other States. Separated from the councils of the three Powers,—where are the rest? What are they about? What can they, what dare they do? They exist only by their connexion with the three Powers. England herself, separated from them, is no longer upon the Continent, but as Napoleon wished her to be, that is, without its pale. The combats of Napoleon with England, were compared to those of the eagle with the whale. The comparison still holds good in the actual relations of England with the three Powers. She can only use the same weapons against them, with which she combated Napoleon; for they are as much beyond her reach as he was; nor would she be willing to ensure the destruction of the few troops at her disposal, by throwing them upon the Continent.

England, therefore, is individually nothing upon the Continent: her only influence there, is from the subsidies she can furnish:—but who would accept these subsidies against enemies so powerful? When they were accepted in the time of Napoleon, what frequently became of them? England is therefore divested of all

direct Continental influence: during the continuance of the Revolutionary war, she exercised an immense one; and it is from always seeing her in the first rank, that we are still induced to attribute to her a peculiar and durable power. It is the twilight by which the day, though past, still appears to exist. This influence has declined by the same means by which it first arose. It proceeded from the connexion with the three Powers, who opposed the Revolution; separated from them, and reduced to her own resources, England has no longer any weight upon the Continent: and it is truly worthy of remark, that the final result of all her efforts, and all she has lavished on the Continent, is, that she now finds herself excluded from it by her own Allies, as effectually as Napoleon himself could have desired; and this at a time when, apparently, the best understanding exists. Thus things have found their own level.

3. That France, considered by herself, is without any active influence; in fact, where, or in what manner could she exercise it? A chain of fortifications extending from Ostend to Basle, isolate her from the rest of the Continent, and will render an egress from her own states impossible. Henceforth the height of her ambition will be to

be able *to offer to the ingress of others, as effective an opposition as she finds to her own.* For a long time to come, (for all the clouds are not yet blown over, all recollections are not yet effaced, all fears are not yet calmed,) every movement purely personal on the part of France, would be attributed to a still existing ambition, and every power would take up arms against her. Her influence then, can only be a moral one. She is allowed to appear in the first rank of satellites, but not as a primary planet, having its own independent course. No; this quality which was hers in the highest degree, and of which she sometimes deprived others, can no longer belong to France; the new state of Europe has divested her of it, and has forbidden her resuming it. These proofs of the subordinate position of France, are sometimes endeavoured to be shaken, by observations upon her diplomatic importance, her thirty millions of inhabitants, her army, the favourable state of her affairs, &c. &c.; from these, it is concluded that she possesses a powerful influence. It is easy to discover how much sincerity there is in this language,—the nature of things will here serve as a sufficient commentary.

These lines are traced by the force of truth

and duty. Writers are bound to expose the whole truth. They are justly chargeable with the errors which they do not correct; and upon this unpleasant subject I pass over many sentiments, in order to define precisely the state of a question, upon which, should any mistakes arise, they might be productive of alarming consequences. The most fatal illusions are sometimes the result of an imprudent zeal, of bitter recollections, or of too great a reliance upon powers improperly estimated; and it is therefore the duty of a good citizen to show the real state of things, that such consequences may be effectually prevented.

4. That there remains upon the Continent but one truly independent state, master of its own actions, fearless for what it possesses, or what it does, vivifying the other states by its support, intimidating them by its defection, strengthened by the distance that exists between them, by its climate, by its isolation and the backwardness of its civilization: this State is Russia,—and what other could it be? Russia forms a class by herself in European sovereignty; she is sufficient to herself, she requires no alliance, dreads none, and thus obtains the mastery in Europe. How much is this supremacy of Russia already felt!

If the countersign of Europe was for some years given from the Tuileries, is it not now given from St. Petersburgh? If it was sometimes said at the Tuileries *he has ceased to reign*, it is now sometimes asked at Petersburgh,—*how* must we reign?—Is it really to be a King, thus to reign after the dictum of another? and how much more vulnerable was the Empire of France, than that of Russia at the present moment!

To the power which Russia already possesses, should be added, the augmentation which must necessarily follow her increase in population and extent of territory; and above all, her association with the manners and arts of modern Europe. It is from civilization, that new Sovereign of Society, that Russia will receive the complement of her power; but, her real strength is at present tempered, and as if veiled by the admirable qualities of a Sovereign, who prefers transplanting the influence of his power to a moral region, rather than employ it in the vulgar career of ambition. Place the ancient Czars, with the manners of their times, on the throne filled by their successor, the eldest son of European civilization, whose delight it is to graft her on the wild stock of Moscovite barbarity, and already would the torrent have overflown Europe,—already new Cimbri and Teutoni would have inundated and

ravaged the Continent, even supposing they had been opposed by a second Marius. The Emperor Alexander is of a different class; he appears compounded of two beings,—the one occupied in developing the resources of his Empire; the other in regulating their application, and in correcting the abuse of them. If the first of these characters demands the gratitude of the Continent, the last must as naturally inspire well founded apprehension and alarm.

As I have elsewhere observed,* Europe has every thing to dread from the civilization of fifty millions of hardy and submissive subjects, and from their initiation into all the European sciences. Though quadrupled in numbers, had they still remained uncivilized, the Russians would be less menacing: it is civilization which renders them formidable. The proof that the vast power of Russia proceeds from her progress in civilization, may be found by comparing her with Turkey. There, extent of empire, added to every advantage of climate, is immense; and yet what a contrast between the two States! Here all is retrogradation,—there all progress. In the latter, a barren and stinted soil, where nature languishes and droops; fields without harvests; lands without population; a people

* Vide—*The Congress of Vienna.*

sinking under their hard taskmasters; and the whole Empire hastening towards destruction. In the former, on the contrary, all is life and animation; deserts become peopled; immense forests, and still more, the prejudices which obscured the mind, are removed, and civilization, with the axe, the compass, and the square, is seen correcting, improving, and renovating the whole Empire, and producing a change destined to transmit and consolidate her power.

This power therefore exists, nor does that discretion which serves it as a support, diminish its influence,—the development of which will in future, depend upon circumstances, and the characters of its possessors. Power is very seductive, and should its flattering temptations be felt by a future Autocrat of this vast state, the world will then feel its effects. In expectation of this catastrophe, more or less distant, but which must inevitably happen, it is easy to predict, that henceforward the fundamental policy of Europe will be that of a continual state of observation and suspicion towards Russia, with the task of providing the best means for her own defence: happy if then it may not prove too late.

Such is the colossus which an age of syste-

matic labours and aggrandizement has formed in the North; such is the result of the Russian campaign, and of the inconsiderate haste with which the Continent threw itself into the arms of this formidable avenger. It is true that he has defeated the power which oppressed it; but he has filled its place; the master only is changed; time will shew what is to be gained by the change.—The rejoicings of Europe at the fall of Napoleon, resemble those of the Grecian cities, when Rome delivered them from the yoke of Philip. The discernment of Europe should have led it to distinguish between France and her chief,—to preserve her power as its shield, even in resolving to depose the man, and to have seen that the road to Paris was shorter and more accessible than that to Petersburgh. The existence of such a power as that of Russia, required a sufficient counterpoise in the West; this, however, cannot be found in a number of Sovereignties, almost equal in strength, but amongst which, not one exists of sufficient extent, to weigh in the balance against that of the East. The increase of civilized Russia, entirely deranges the fabric of European policy. Nothing could have been more favourable to it, than this unfortunate distribution of the West. Napoleon foresaw the consequences: but unfortunately his measures aggravated and

confirmed the evil: it is from his hands that Russia has received the sceptre of the Continent. Future ages will feel all the consequences of these two errors; they are of the same nature as those that fix the destinies of the universe. There is too much cause to apprehend that henceforward, and for a long period, the history of the Continent may but too justly be entitled "*Tutelle de l'Europe par la Russie.*" Such appear to us to be the statistics of the European powers: but to complete the picture, let us now enquire,—what is the mental state of the Continent, or rather its moral statistics.

CHAP. II.

MORAL STATISTICS OF EUROPE IN GENERAL.

In this chapter, I propose examining the moral tendency of the people of Europe under one head only—the minor divisions will be found in their proper place.

How is the population of Europe generally inclined towards Governments? To which do they most visibly tend—towards limited or arbitrary Governments? On which side does the evidence of utility, and that of facts range itself; and when this twofold evidence coincides, does not opposition to it appear ridiculous? Upon an unprejudiced examination of the question, who can imagine that men, *in foro conscientiæ*, do not prefer Governments regulated by equable laws, to those which are directed solely by individual will, and subject to all the inconveniences inseparable from human weakness. There are questions which need only be asked to be resolved, and surely this is one. To be otherwise, man should renounce that which most honourably distinguishes and con-

stitutes humanity, knowledge, and sensibility; in a word, that faculty which gives him both the means of knowing what is beneficial to him, and the instinct which leads him to appropiate it to himself. So long as these attributes exist in man, they certainly will not remain inactive in the recesses of his heart; but will stimulate him to attain that which he conceives conducive to the amelioration of his condition.

Man must not be considered as one of those animals which, though the ablest architects of their species, never arrive at the point of appropriating to themselves the art of constructing habitations different from those taught them by a uniform instinct. On the contrary, man is a being gifted with the faculty of contemplating the most distant, as well as the nearest objects, in order to acquire that which procures him the enjoyment of all the productions of the world. How then can it be doubted, that whilst two thirds of Europe have succeeded in different degrees, and with more or less good fortune, in escaping from an arbitrary to a constitutional system; that whilst the people of all countries, have, by means of communications, which are continually increasing in a ratio hitherto unknown, become both witnesses

and spectators of every thing which is said or done in every part of the world; when they must be continually awake to all the great events which are continually taking place; how can it be doubted that they should be alive to such powerful motives, that they should be capable of calmly contemplating every thing which occurs elsewhere, and not be desirous of turning to their own advantage the good which they discover? To believe this, one must suppose nature to be changed, and the human heart to be different from what it was, when first formed by the Creator.

Let us then consider it as unquestionable, that the certain and irresistible tendency of the European masses inclines them towards legal or constitutional Governments. This is already the feeling of two-thirds of the European population, the remaining one cannot but follow the example. This has been proved alike by Naples, Piedmont, Mexico, and the Brazils; for this impulse is not limited to one place, nor to Europe, the ocean cannot confine it: it is a movement of the whole world. At this moment Greece is entering upon the same career; certainly it is not in favour of arbitrary power that she combats. Wherever armed force does not

prevent it, this tendency manifests itself; nor can it be doubted that were this force withdrawn but for a short period, and the nations under despotic sway allowed to follow their own inclinations, a rapid and unanimous movement would direct them towards the constitutional Government, which they see established in so many countries. If, for instance, the force under which Naples and Piedmont now groan, and which, from recent occurrences, has been felt throughout all Italy, and compels those two countries to dissemble their real sentiments, were to be withdrawn, is it to be believed that Italy would remain under its actual form of Government; or that she would not, by a simultaneous effort, pass at once to the constitutional form? The same would happen in Prussia, if we may credit all that has been reported of her inclinations.

If we wish to discover the real disposition of Germany, the sure means of doing so, is to examine the sentiments which burst forth at the same moment from men of science, as well as from the youth of that country: both are marching in the same line, and forming the same vows for liberty; and not only would they every where become nominally and ostensibly consti-

tutional, but, rejecting the false colouring with which prejudice or interest has tinged constitutional acts in many places, they would be seen forming new establishments upon principles free from that alloy which has elsewhere debased them.

From what has been stated, it is evident that Europe is divided into two forms of Government, the one constitutional, the other arbitrary, but expecting also in its turn to become constitutional. This is the first general division that is observable in Europe. The second exists in the very centre of those constitutional Governments, which are not more uniform among themselves, than those which are arbitrary. In some their representatives meet every year, in others, at longer intervals; here they speak loudly; there only in whispers; all is contrast and contradiction. Further, by this new order of division into two different modes of Government, Europe has lost another species of conformity, viz. that which existed in similar institutions contained in each state. They presented models of uniform existence in all its principal qualities: thus, throughout Europe in general, the Clergy and the Nobility enjoyed useful or honorary privileges, which coincided the one with the

other. At present this uniformity is destroyed, the privileges preserved in one country, have disappeared in many others; in the one, the Clergy are maintained by properties belonging to the church; in others salaries are affixed to all public services. The Revolution having destroyed the common bond which existed between institutions, they have by that means lost the greater part of their strength.

Europe is then a nonconformist in its general, as well as in its particular divisions. This nonconformity, moreover, is converted into opposition, by the dispositions it creates and maintains in the minds of its inhabitants. Hence proceeds that uneasiness which is felt throughout the Continent, and which causes some Governments to regard others with a jealous and almost hostile eye, to be always seeking the means of gaining an influence in their interior, and to live in a state of mistrust with a part of their own subjects. This state of things is serious; it is not considered, and still less treated in a manner its nature requires; alarms and accusations are conceived to be remedies, yet nothing can be more different.

Such appears to be the moral state of Europe

taken in a general point of view; the description will be completed by the exposition of the resistance which is opposed to the dispositions of the people, and by the results which may be produced by this resistance, which leads us to a consideration of the Holy Alliance, and of the Quintuple Alliance.

CHAP. III.

THE HOLY ALLIANCE AND THE QUINTUPLE ALLIANCE.

Holy Alliance!—There is something in this word which reminds us of the crusades and mysticism. I am far from attaching any ridiculous or contemptuous idea to this expression; but though the name has for years past been familiar to us, we have not yet assigned to it any precise or definite meaning: it appears to me, that between powers purely political and temporal, alliances, as well as all other acts, are exclusively of a political kind, and that they should be presented to the world under no other form than their natural one.

The Holy Alliance cannot be a purely religious association, for the contracting parties do not profess the same communion—it cannot be purely moral, for it neither enjoins nor forbids any thing, nor does it legislate upon any moral subjects; and then the idea of morality being enforced by bayonets!! there would be no harmony between the principles and their

results. Is it political? Then why this profession of morality and religion? There is no community of interests between the contracting parties, on the contrary, they may even be found to clash. The basis of this alliance, is not clearly defined, a circumstance in itself sufficiently alarming, and the more so from its connexion with an immense power; for the greater the power, the greater the necessity of coming to a clear understanding with it.

The kings of Europe, and especially the emperor Alexander, says Mr. Guizot, struck with the excesses and the evils arising from our revolution, and alarmed at the violent passions and the immorality with which it was accompanied, have resolved to preserve Europe from the consequences of similar convulsions. They have united with the intention of maintaining order and peace.

What right resulted from this pious design? Previous to conferring any right, it imposed two duties, in the first place that of regulating their own conduct according to the principles they were endeavouring to enforce, that it might serve as an example for those whom they were desirous of instructing; and, lastly, that of watching more narrowly at home, every thing

likely to excite dissension. The allies possessed the right of endeavouring to influence, by means of remonstrance, those countries where dissensions might be apprehended: but it appears to me that this was the extent of their prerogative.

The most important of all rights, as well of nations as of individuals, the essential element of their liberty, is that of being free from all species of internal dependence. It is a sanctuary, the threshold of which no one has the right to overstep, to tread on which is violation. The same principle is equally favourable to all; to him who possesses the right without power, as to him who can call in power to the support of right. Right knows no degree; there is no scale for its admeasurement; it is entire where it is genuine; equal for all to whom it may belong: it is the same for the republic of Santa Maria and the empire of Germany, as it was for the petty republics of Greece, and for Rome the mistress of the universe. When the latter established two *rights*, the one for herself, the other for weaker States, the universe was lost. Such are the consequences of a disregard to *right:* now who can have the right of interfering in the internal arrangements of other countries, of amending them, of hold-

ing them as it were subjected to a religious or moral inquisition. What may not be the consequence of such a legislation introduced by the most powerful? Who will oppose, or be able to escape the effects of such injustice? The rational tendency of all power is to extend itself, and not to condemn its own actions: when therefore it wishes to apply the jurisdiction it has arrogated to itself, it does so, it knows how to effect it, and to give a reason for so doing. All history demonstrates this lamentable truth, and the example of Naples has confirmed it in such a manner as to justify the animadversions of the British Government in the circular* addressed to its ministers at all the courts of Europe; a document in which it declares the principles of the three powers united at Troppau, to be incompatible with the independence of other states, capable of an arbitrary application, and destructive to the rights of nations. The powers allied against Napoleon might remain united against him so long as that war continued; there are therefore no objections to be made to the treaties entered into, relative to their opposition to the common enemy: in this case they were strictly within their right; but he being deposed, the object of their coalition was attained; and its dissolution naturally fol-

* Of the 19th of February, 1821.

lowed from the completion of its purpose; but between this and the establishing over Europe a self-styled moral regency, which naturally resolves into a political dictature, the difference is immense.

By the natural and anticipated effect of this reunion, two consequences have arisen, which were inevitable.

1. That no state would dare to undertake any thing without first insuring the concurrence of the Holy Alliance, as an indispensable preliminary.

2. That a part of this coalition has occupied itself in the internal affairs of other states, and has declared its intention of interesting itself for those it has made the objects of its solicitude. Here, is opened to the world a new order of things. The relative independence of nations is one of the highest questions of social order: this has been Rousseau's *ne plus ultra*, in his Social Contract.—The Holy Alliance has decided the question; and it is worthy of remark that among the members of this association, there are some who would not, with respect to Naples, associate themselves to acts proceeding from the principles of the associa-

tion, and recognised as such by their allies. Decisions so peremptory and so harsh should at least have been unanimous; but that which surpasses all received opinions, as to the nature of tribunals, is that of this one. Where does its prerogative commence? where does it end? upon whom and in what form is it exercised? Every judicial action should have an express object; in this, I perceive none. On the contrary, I see it continually changing, it is in full operation as to Naples, but in a perfectly quiescent state with respect to Portugal and Spain, and yet what difference is there between the first and the two last? Here, it condemns and attacks with armed force what, in another place, it leaves uncensured and unreproved; thus shewing, in two cases perfectly similar, a total want of that just equilibrium in the scales of justice, which constitutes the safety, the consolation, and the instruction of the universe. Would the strong, the powerful, the most powerful, permit, within their dominions, the juridical exercise of such a foreign tribunal? For instance, had England divided itself between the king and the queen, and a collision taken place between the parliamentary aristocracy and the indigent democracy which now constitute the two great factions in England, surely it would have been a fine op-

portunity for a display of the zeal of the Holy Alliance. Well! would it have interfered? and, upon its approach, would not the whole people of England, laying aside every other consideration, and intent only on preserving the first right of nations, their independence, have lined the shores to oppose their progress, assured, that after having freed themselves from foreign interference, they might return to settle their own differences among themselves at leisure? From the time of the Romans, who, according to Montesquieu, made themselves the umpires of the world, that they might subdue it, there has been no precedent for this, and the public laws of Europe now appear to be changed; a reunion of preponderating powers, with the right of correcting the social disorders of other countries, and without defining in what those disorders consist! Europe did not interfere in the quarrels between Charles I. and the people of England: she did not meddle in the war between Philip II. and the Dutch, in that of the Swiss with Austria, combats for sovereignty, which have all tended to dissolve the ties which united the people to their ancient forms of government. In cases of contagion, each power is authorized to form a cordon within its own frontier; but it has not the right of including those of its neigh-

bours. I do not find that Europe furnishes contingents for guarding the Lazarettos of Spain and Italy, under pretext of the insufficiency of the precautionary means adopted in those countries. When the Holy Alliance invested itself with the preserving and sanitary mission for social Europe, why did it include some powers only? Has not the whole body of the sovereignty of Europe the same interests, and, consequently, the same rights? I seek its representatives and its organs in this association; England being clearly and completely constitutional, could not accede to this coalition. If France had been so in the same degree, if the right of concluding treaties given to the crown by the charter had been restricted by narrower limits than those which have been fixed, and which exceed the just measure in such a degree as to exclude the state from deciding on its dearest interests; France, I repeat, would no more than England have formed a part of the Holy Alliance. Constitutional Spain and Portugal have disavowed it; Sweden and the kingdom of Holland, both important states, do not form part of it. All the states of less magnitude, several of which are, notwithstanding, denominated *kingdoms*, are not admitted into it; the Helvetian republic, the sole remains of that order of government in Europe, does not

appear in it either: does it belong then only to monarchical governments of the first class to watch over the interests of social order, as well as those of the sovereignty of nations? Are not these interests the same for all human associations, whatever their form or extent? It appears in all this, either that the rights of a few are greatly extended, or that those common to all are much restricted.

I think I can discover the first germ of the Holy Alliance in the meeting at Pilnitz, in 1791, and in the appeals which the emigrants and the other enemies of the revolution, as well in as out of France have continually made to Europe against it. Burke was the most striking apostle of this doctrine, but his effusions upon this subject are not the happiest productions of his pen, at times so fertile in substantial and brilliant truths. When the aristocracy in France felt itself overpowered by the national energy, convinced of its own weakness, and despairing of ever being able to regain its ascendancy by its own exertions, it summoned Europe to its aid, and intreated her to assist its impotency. From that time the only cry was, the danger of the throne and of social order, of revenging them by force of arms, of a coalition of

kings against the revolution; the crusade was proclaimed with the sound of the trumpet, but in the vague manner attendant upon all undefined charges. This cant resounded on all sides, In France, and beyond the Rhine and the Channel, the dangers of social order became the theme of all the declarations and addresses with which cabinets were besieged. This doctrine, despised and rejected for a long period, reanimated in our days by political rhetoricians who have undertaken, since 1814, to foretel and announce the end of the world, which has but little need of them, if it does not tread in their footsteps, has at last taken root in a soil tormented by alarms, or misled by false lights. It may be also, that deviations from the true spirit of religion have had some influence in the formation of an association which, at first sight, appears a mixture of mysticism and policy; it is difficult to follow throughout the whole of their course the effects of secret causes and of personal affections; the latter have always so great a share in human affairs.

In arguing this question, I only consider it in the relation it stands in to the whole world —public right. To the respect due to pure intentions, we should also add, that which is

equally due to the rights of nations: right has neither illusions nor dangers to contend with, from both of which virtue herself is not always exempted.

The Holy Alliance may be termed a defensive alliance against the workings of ambition and the immoral proceedings which have too often dishonoured politics, and the grand work just accomplished by the contracting powers, renders this interpretation a plausible one. The ambition for which Napoleon was reproached, the crookedness of his policy, had armed them against him: that they should engage themselves not to imitate that which they had just punished in another, was a natural consequence; and thus far, nothing can be more moral than the Holy Alliance, nothing more worthy of its title; but once without the limit of this circle, farewell the guarantees, which, in its first state, it appeared to give; personal preservation then predominates over every other consideration: thus perhaps may be explained the little success the appearance of this federation has obtained in Europe, the religious veil of which concealed its real character; it was thus from its nature calculated to cause alarm as to its probable consequences.

But let us examine the extent of our riches, and we must acknowledge that no age has ever been so fertile in alliances.—Besides the Holy Alliance, we have also the Quintuple Alliance; the latter is formed by the coalition of France to the quadruple alliance which defeated Napoleon, and which has rendered France the service of stripping her of all her conquests; after being oppressed by it for five years, France has ended by becoming a party to it. Her incorporation dates from the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle.

This confederation presents a spectacle altogether new, and gives rise to a great number of reflections.

What is this confederation? The reunion of the strength of Europe. What is an alliance in the ordinary acceptation of the term? The union of certain powers for purposes either offensive or defensive, or of overcoming other powers in a state of hostility towards them; all alliances up to the present time have been so formed; their principles and their intentions were defined. Those which so long combated Louis XIV. were of this nature; those which were opposed to Charles V. and to Frederick, in remote times the league of Cambray, in our

own days, the armed neutrality of the northern powers, all presented the same characters; but if Louis XIV. and Charles V. had become the allies of their adversaries, where would have been the alliance, and the end for which it was formed? And what is an alliance without a certain and definite object? As, when every one is in the secret, it is no longer a secret, so, when all are on one side, there may be concurrence, but there can no longer be alliance. —What would be said if all Europe should suddenly declare itself in alliance?

That of which we are speaking, can be neither offensive nor defensive: for who has it to attack, and against whom can it have to defend itself? Is it against its own members? then where is the Alliance? Is it against those who are not included in the Alliance? but where are they, where can they be, the other States being so inferior in strength, compared with the Allies, can it be probably supposed, that any one entertains hostile intentions?

Here then, as in the Holy Alliance, is felt the vague principle of the association; it is not distinctly perceived: but the same cannot be said of its consequences: they are too evident, for there is instantly discovered in them an

amphyctionic tribunal, which has arrogated to itself the general direction of Europe. It is here, that all matters are terminated; as soon as an event happens, a congress is formed, it decides; it is even sometimes the case that the parties are neither cited to appear, nor listened to, and this has already been seen with respect to Naples, the fate of which was decided at Troppau, without appeal, without even allowing her the means of being heard.

Here again recur all those considerations of public right upon the independence of nations, which we have already indulged in when treating of the Holy Alliance: here, I again seek for the whole body of European Sovereignty, but cannot discover it: all the less powerful are excluded, and the whole management of European affairs is lodged in the hands of the five principal states.

Right is the legitimate master of the world, but it is not to be found in this Alliance; nor are the purest intentions equivalents for it, for by its nature it is not to be replaced. The same want of harmony, so apparent in the Holy Alliance, is to be remarked in its prototype the Quintuple Alliance, for in reality, the two form

but one and the same Alliance: the common interest of four of its members, is opposition to the aggrandizement of Russia. France, though at a distance from her, is as repugnant to it as her nearer neighbours. England is in the same state: certainly she would not consider the affairs of Turkey in the same light with Russia: it may prove her interest to defend, what it might be that of Russia to attack. In the general state of Europe, the opposition of these two powers is a natural, permanent, and necessary state; they are constantly and every where opposed to each other. England, free from all apprehension from the Continent, requiring no support, finds herself bound by the force of circumstances to oppose Russia, as a state which threatens Europe; her position, with regard to this power, is the same that it was towards France, when in her turn, the latter domineered over Europe. The proud character of protectress of the liberties of Europe against this colossus, has devolved to her in consequence of her insular situation, and of the perfection of her institutions, which give her government a strength which no other can acquire.

It is necessary to form a distinct idea of the composition of this Alliance. Some of its

members have obtained a place in it, in consequence of the deference which cannot be refused to States powerful in themselves, but of which circumstances retard the development. Such is the position of France; surely she possesses every thing requisite to place a State at the head of an Alliance, whatever it may be; but internal commotions, or past occurrences have unnerved that power which is her right, and cause her to be received into this coalition, as if by courtesy only. We must not be imposed upon by appearances, but estimate things as they really are. It is usual in all great political transactions, that the States which do not form a primitive or essential part of them, should endeavour to interfere in order to save their own consequence, and that they may not experience that species of depreciation which proceeds from exclusion. But at least we must always return to the reality of power, and in the Quintuple Alliance, it is certainly in the north that it exists. England adds nothing to it; the Continent is the grand theatre; France has incapacitated herself from contesting any thing with the rest, or promoting her own interest: her pride may murmur at it, but her destiny enslaves her. There remain then, as the foundation of the Quintuple Alliance, Russia, Prussia, and Austria: which

réduces the quintuple to a triple Alliance. The deduction from all that we have urged, is, this fundamental and incontrovertible truth, that by whatever name Alliances are designated, whatever may be the number of the contracting parties, there is no solid alliance but in the conformity of permanent interests; all the rest, as Solomon said, is but vanity and vexation of spirit.

CHAP. IV.

PACIFIC DISPOSITION OF EUROPE, IN 1821.

SINCE the Congress of Vienna, the policy of the principal Cabinets, by which that of all the others is regulated, has always been the maintenance of peace: this justice we cannot refuse them.

The certainty of this fact, results, not from the military power, which is every where too considerable, whether as considered in itself, or with respect to the actual wants of the interior of each State, nor even from the often renewed declarations of the principal powers; for proclamations are frequently belied by facts, but from the nature of circumstances, which are more solid guarantees.

Disputes about territorial interests, the ordinary source of wars, are at an end. It is true that some powers may find themselves restricted and cramped in their present circum-

scribed state; others may feel hurt on comparing the present with the past: Prussia may be affected in this way, by the misshapen form of her territory, and her being deprived of frontiers: surely she would have preferred Saxony to the Grand Duchy of the Rhine, that egregious blunder of the Congress of Vienna; on the other hand, Saxony may regret her ancient territory, and the gifts conferred upon her by Napoleon; there is no doubt that Bavaria would have been better satisfied had she retained the power to which Napoleon had elevated her, than with that left her by the treaty of Ried; for the indemnities promised her by this treaty, she is now, and must long remain in expectation.

But notwithstanding the truth, and the weight of these grievances, all these States are equally sensible that there is something stronger than their personal sentiments, and this something is neither more nor less than a necessity resulting from the political constitution of the European association, the whole fabric of which must be shaken, before any partial change could be effected. From the same feeling having become habitual to all, it follows that every one contributed towards the same end, and that a general peace is the necessary result of

the effort which all are making for the maintenance of that which exists, unconnected with any consideration as to its intrinsic value, or to the effects which each may individually experience from it. The powerful are jealous of each other, but they distinctly see the consequence of contests which might divide them, and therefore, they use every means to prevent their existence. The weak, happy in being able to preserve themselves, limit their ambition to this object, and tremble at the very idea of a storm gathering over their own heads, or those of their neighbours. With nothing to gain, and every thing to lose, they evidently have not, nor can they have any other object than that of insuring to themselves a fostering peace, or the protection of a State more or less powerful. Resignation has become for all, that forced merit, that melancholy virtue which is created by necessity.

Further, a uniformity of age and similarity of fortune strengthen the friendship of the principal Sovereigns; they have all undergone great trials, and great reverses: Moscow, Vienna, Berlin, have not always been in their possession: restored at the same time, and by common exertions to sovereignty and the enjoyments of tranquil power, every thing tends

to the belief, that they are equally desirous of not compromising that which they have recovered, and that ties formed in their common career will consolidate the work they have accomplished. The years promised to them, by the general course of nature, will prolong the duration of this epocha of public quiet; but, from the nature of things, should a war arise, it could not fail of becoming general; the consequences of such a scourge are too fatal not to seek every means to prevent it. The reign of war in Europe has been a long one. That it should be so, was natural, from the then state of things. Peace now reigns, by a similar combination of circumstances.

The wars of Naples and Turkey are no objection to this view of the present disposition of Europe, because,

1st. The former does not deserve this title, it being restricted to a very short military promenade. To wage war, there must be two parties; and, in this instance, the second did not appear upon the field.

2d. The latter does not belong to Europe. The scene is, as it were, beyond her limits, between actors who are strangers to her. It is

a quarrel which, neither in its origin nor progress, she has any concern with. It is of foreign importation, like the yellow fever and the plague. The European Powers have done nothing to excite it; on the contrary, they have done every thing to prevent its bursting forth.

These two events do not derogate, in any thing, from the truth of the assertion advanced as the general principle of the state of Europe, and as the head of this chapter, viz, that a pacific disposition has formed one of the distinguishing characters of its policy, during the year which has just expired, and that it appears destined to influence those which are to come.

It is the assurance of the permanency of this pacific state which renders so painful to the heart and mind of the observer, the friend of man and of social order, the spectacle of that accumulation of soldiers, every where to be remarked, but more particularly in the three coalesced States. Under what class, human or social, shall we range this mass of weapons, this converting portions of the earth into arsenals and barracks, volcanoes always ready to pour forth their burning and all-destroying lava? What liberty does this leave to others? It, therefore, only exists for one. An attitude

so warlike must excite mutual fears; these Powers, therefore, are continually restless, ever in a state of suspicion, in anxiety for the present, and alarm for the future. They may even be said to be in subjection, for however they may affect equality among themselves, it is easily perceived, that they are not equal upon all points; that the degrees of reciprocal liberty are in a ratio with those of power; and that, in spite of this affected intimacy, some signs of patronage may be discovered. Napoleon also was beloved, from the fear he caused. What a tax is imposed upon all, by the keeping up so formidable an armament by a few! It is no longer, in proportion to their own necessities or means, that States are armed, but in proportion to the armaments of others, and the apprehensions which they occasion. Does not Russia, with her millions of soldiers, levy a conscription over all Europe? Does not her sword present to all that continent, a spectre, similar to the sword of Damocles? At all events, independence is lost. The one becomes compulsively the regulator of the other, taxes and decimates her inhabitants and wealth. For instance, if England fills her ports with ships of war, France must follow her example, and, for this purpose, is compelled to expend annually, almost without the least advantage,

more than fifty millions. And it is in the midst of actual peace, cemented by a thousand interests, that all these means of war are accumulated, and are always increasing. Surely, to prevent fire, it is but common prudence not to multiply its aliments. Half the wars have been occasioned by the means of carrying them on. Frederick the Great avowed this in his exposition of the motives of his first attack against Maria Theresa.

What would Montesquieu have said, who has written with such acuteness and truth upon this military mania, which announced itself in his days, and which he called a new disease,* (as, in fact, it is a very cruel one,) had he witnessed the progress it has made in our time, and could he be acquainted with present occurrences?

Certainly, great confidence should be placed in the personal disposition of him who has to direct this gigantic force; but we must observe, that whoever may be its actual director,

* Spirit of Laws, book xiii. chap. xvii. commencing with these words:—"A new disease has spread itself over Europe; it has attacked our Princes, and causes them to keep up an enormous number of troops;" and concluding with these:—"And soon, by dint of having soldiers, we shall have nothing but soldiers, and shall become Tartars."

the power exists, and it is that which causes the danger; that we cannot command the circumstances which may call it into action; that man's disposition is not to be depended upon; that his existence is but short; that it would be necessary that he should transmit his disposition, together with his power, to those who, in their turn, may be the disposers of it. How strong a cuirass must that be, which should defend a heart against the allurements of ambition, or the charms of what is denominated glory. Perhaps, the first emotion of ambition, felt by a Russian Emperor, would very nearly involve the extinction of the liberties of Europe. And how great must be the sacrifices to maintain them, in a state so precarious, so uncertain!

The example of France is a perpetual lesson before our eyes. She decreed the abjuration of conquest and an eternal peace, by arming three millions of men. Some years afterwards, she defied the whole strength of Europe. Enlightened men saw war in the armament itself, in spite of all the assurances of pacific and disinterested intentions. They knew that three millions of men could not arm themselves, with the intention of remaining idle. In all this, I am as little actuated by national

jealousy as by the wish of exciting angry feelings against any one. I only describe the state of Europe and its dangers, and the evidence of facts but too well justifies my words. Charles V. Louis XIV. and Napoleon, have been the three bugbears of the liberties of Europe. But what were they, with all their power, compared to Russia? A simple Elector of Saxony, surprising Charles V. at Inspruck, changed the fortune of this powerful Monarch. The grand Alliance brought Louis XIV. to the brink of a precipice, and, in our days, the quadruple Alliance has precipitated Napoleon into it. Now, how is the same to be effected, with regard to Russia? On what point is she accessible, and what sensible injury can be inflicted on her? Thus, to enlightened minds, Russia appears the sole truly independent State. Every other Power counts more or less links in its chain, but whatever be their number or colour, it is nevertheless a chain.

As the end of all these alliances, the supreme Directors of Europe, is peace and the preservation of it, would it not be natural to commence, by removing the possibility of war, by cutting short the means of engaging in it; that is to say, by reducing the military state of each Power to what reason and real necessity require; for, in fact, is it not inconsistent, and

even deceitful, to speak of peace, with the sword in our hands? Surely, the Holy Alliance, already gifted with the wisdom of Minerva, would inspire more confidence, did it appear invested with the attributes of that pacific Goddess, rather than with those of Mars and Bellona; and the title which it has assumed would acquire a benign reality, were its power employed to deliver Europe from a part of that military which has ravaged, and which still oppresses* and ruins her; two evils which demand the application of an immediate remedy.

* The reader must refer to my observations in the *Congress of Vienna*, and in my other writings. This doctrine is not new with me.

	Fr.
I have shewn, that, in France, the army and the navy consume the sum of - - - - - including military pensions, half-pay, and invalids.	300,000,000
That, in Europe, this same expense exceeded that is to say, more than all the (*contributions foncières*,) taxes on landed property of the whole of Europe, which does not amount to more than - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	2,000,000,000
	1,500,000,000
That war having been the cause of nearly all its debts, we must add their amount to the expense of the military establishment in Europe, and as it cannot be estimated at less than -	1,200,000,000

It is clearly proved, that four-fifths of the taxes paid in Europe have been occasioned by war, and again contribute to its support.

CHAP. V.

CONSTITUTIONAL SPIRIT, IN 1821.

Every age has its peculiar character, which chiefly influences that particular epoch. In order, therefore, to form a correct idea of the direction of affairs, in 1821, its peculiar character must first be determined.

What is the constitutional spirit generally, and in itself?

The tendency towards a regular Government.

Is this a natural tendency? Who can deny it, or say the same of an unnatural one? An irregular order may be tolerated, but it will never be desired. Humanity is subject to a thousand ills. Are these the effect of its condition or its choice? Men have tolerated despotism, from ignorance of a better state, or from want of power to relieve themselves from it; but they have neither created nor de-

manded it. We suffer evil, but we choose good. Let us resume.

What is the constitutional spirit, with regard to the people?

The desire of obtaining a regular Government, when they have the misfortune to be deprived of it; and that of preserving it, when they have the good fortune to enjoy it; for the greatest good and the greatest evil to them are to enjoy it, or to be robbed of it. Robbed is the very word, for the right of all is to possess it.

Is this the spirit which has manifested itself, during the year 1821?

In Europe, look at Italy and Greece.

In America, the Brazils and Mexico.

The loss of this system in Italy proves nothing against the existence of such a spirit in that country; for this loss was the effect of armed violence, and the work of foreigners. It is true, this acquisition was ill-defended by those who had acquired it; the reasons for which we shall give hereafter. But let Austria

leave Italy to herself, and withdraw her battalions, and it will soon be seen on which side are her inclinations. It certainly is an excellent method of appreciating the dispositions of a country, to commence by overrunning it with soldiers, and then to argue upon what it tolerates, says, does, or publishes, under the hands of Hungarians and Sclavonians. *The inspiration effected by bayonets may, with good reason, appear suspicious.* A truly constitutional spirit exists then in the centre of the world. It manifests itself in every part where it does not meet the soldiers of its enemies. It has burst forth in some parts of Italy, it ferments in all. Momentary violence represses it; but it is not to be doubted, that this violence, in rendering the privation more sensible, in making its injustice more keenly felt, only serves to prepare a more decisive explosion, a more complete detonation, when the hour shall have arrived.

At this moment, the constitutional spirit (for the Revolution of Greece is only this) induces an unhappy people to face the horrors of a contest against barbarians as devoid of the light of reason as of the sentiments of humanity; still more remote, this same spirit, hovering over the waves, and overstepping the seas, invades another hemisphere, and gives a new

face to those vast regions extending from the shores of the Vermillion Sea to the Straits of Magellan. Oh, prodigy! The constitutional system seats itself, at the same moment, upon the Tribune of Athens, upon the barren country of Sparta, upon the Throne of Alexander, and displays itself, occupying the spot once filled by the Thrones of the Incas and of Montezuma. No, never did any motive develope itself with such force, nor to such extent. Up to the present time, the greatest change the universe has ever experienced, is the introduction of Christianity; but, how much is not this surpassed by that of the constitutional order! The former required ages before it occupied some few provinces of the Roman empire. In a few years, Europe and America have become the conquest of the latter. Acknowledge its power. Like those enchanters who had the power of raising or calming the waves of the sea, the wish to obtain it agitated all nations, and its approach appeased them. This has been proved in Spain, in Portugal, in Naples, and the Brazils. In this last country, it is this spirit that watches over the preservation of her ties with Portugal; without it, they would be rent asunder. The Prince himself could not hesitate with respect to it. The unanimous will of the country forced him to

accept it, without hesitation. The confidence which this act inspired, led him to believe he might absent himself from the Brazils. He has not been deceived, and the same constitutional spirit has suppressed an independence, which, without its aid, whether in the presence, or in the absence of the King, would equally have burst forth. What more can be added to its glory, or to the demonstration of its power? The movement began in 1789 has not stopped an instant, and it will only cease from want of fuel, that is to say, with the extinction of the world. And it is with such a spectacle before us, that the tendency of the world is doubted,—that petty quarrels are sought in order to escape from it, to elude engagements entered into; that recriminations are made, and petty fears held out to the future! Oh! how poor, futile, empty and impotent is all this! What weapons to combat the designs of the universe! What a bank to arrest the torrent that carries it away! For instance, England, France, Holland, Sweden, Poland, Bavaria, Wurtemburg, Baden, Spain, Portugal, now form the European domains of the constitutional order. Thousands of acts daily emanate from this new system as its consequences, and become in their turn so many supporters of it, and so many anchors which secure the vessel to the

shore. All states have taken this new direction, and follow it with as little effort as their ancient one required. The new order has become a habit, and has acquired the right of citizenship.—From this proceed two consequences.

1. The impossibility of disturbing it: by what right, and by what means could it be effected?

2. The impossibility of preventing the efforts its presence alone cannot fail of producing upon people, who see it, and are deprived of it. And may we be permitted to say, that it is here that Governors are evidently at fault: they appear to believe their subjects deaf and blind: they forbid them to compare themselves with others, or to desire to resemble them in any thing useful they may perceive: they permit them to receive from those countries all that may afford them *material utility*, either as regards the arts, the sciences, or riches, the field is left open to them; but as to moral utility, the desire of having some influence in their own affairs, no longer to suffer the imposition of taxes, but to concede them according to their necessities, to forego a part of their liberties only to the laws, and to refuse

to do so to arbitrary will:—Ah! there all approach is prohibited; repression more or less violent takes place, and in case of need, accusations of commotion, and what is still worse, of *liberalism* are brought forward. But violence and accusation, each equally odious, what can they prevent—what can they alter in the nature of things, in the minds and hearts of men? Certainly in the actual state of things, either the human heart is false, or decidedly constitutional.

The tendency of the mind is always clearly indicated by the nature of the writings, for which it shews a preference; and if the saying be correct, that the mind of a man can be estimated by the books composing his library, it is equally true, that the national disposition may be discovered by a similar proof. Now, what is the species of writings which an impartial examination would consider as most engaging the public attention; when I say writings, I do not mean to include that crowd of religious or political romancers, whose sole intent is merely to increase the belief of their importance, and their number. Amongst the many harangues pronounced from the rostrums of any country; which are they that create the most lively interest? Will it be denied that they are those

which treat of social, that is to say, constitutional order? It is the same with all other publications, amongst which those relating to the constitutional system are the only ones that possess eclat and durability, whilst all others are mere ephemera.

The public mind of Europe is now evidently turned towards the discussions of the constitutional system, as it was in the sixteenth century towards religious questions; in the present day it is not more possible to divert it, than it was then to make it lose sight of the points of religious controversy that had arisen, and produced those cruel contentions, which during two hundred years disturbed the public tranquillity, and caused so much bloodshed throughout Europe.

There is a season for all things; to oppose it when it declares itself, is fruitless, because it is thwarting the course of nature, a thing always impossible, and which has succeeded but ill for those who have attempted it: it would be as useless, as to attempt to stop the course of the seasons or the sap, which nature sets in motion to produce the fruits and flowers she brings us yearly. In the present age, the world is placed in precisely the same position with regard to

social order: the latter has undergone a complete reformation, a regeneration, the consequence of an absolute new order of ideas. It is the season for constitutions which drives before it the long darkness of absolute systems, as contrary to legitimate rule as they are unfounded in legal right; and when the tatters of these discredited systems have in so many places been thrown to the winds, it is too late to eulogize their miserable remnants. Considering all that concurs to strengthen this system, there may be some foundation for hoping that it is for the last time we shall hear it said, (as was the case in 1820, in consequence of some delay having taken place in the election notices,) that henceforth the Chambers would cease to be assembled, and that we should in future be governed by ordinances. Thus would have been realized the first wish of the aristocracy, and of the enemies of all constitutions; but had they well considered all that is contained in these few words? How expressive these three words, *govern by ordinances!* This threw us back even beyond the old regime, and into a system altogether novel. Besides, why should the inestimable blessings of a Government by ordinance be reserved for France alone? Why not extend it to England, who would certainly eagerly ac-

cept it? But why in such a case should we not act in France, as they would not fail to act in England? For all my researches to discover a difference of rights between an Englishman and a Frenchman, have been in vain.

We may form an opinion of the state of the public mind as to the constitutional system, from the multiplicity of questions and occurrences attendant upon this system; which, at its commencement excited so much emotion, but which at present appears familiarized by habit, and no longer causes any sensation. How many men who formerly frowned at the mere name of *constitution* and *charter*, are now engaged in the constitutional system, and enjoy that renown and consideration, which without it they never would have attained. Things have found their own level, as it always happens; which ought to render us very circumspect in our clamours against the commencement of any system, be it what it may. Habits are formed little by little, education completes itself, and we find ourselves placed naturally, and as it were fixed to the place, where before we had either feared or disdained to place our feet; and all this without being able to account to ourselves for the manner in which we had arrived there, and still less to perceive how we can leave the track into

which, day by day, and step by step, we have found ourselves led.

I should be glad, if all the great enemies of the constitutional system, those who have so great a repugnance to all ideas of charter, and those also, to whom all deliberative assemblies appear so insupportable, would do me the favour to say, by what door they would escape from the constitutional system now established, and by what road they would direct their steps after having left it; but since an immense, irresistible, and always encreasing mass of constitutional spirit exists in the centre of European societies, nay, of mankind, and forms the foundation of its spirit, it is natural to endeavour to discover what is the principle of this spirit, and the exciter of its progress. I discover them in civilisation: and this leads me to speak of civilisation and its influence.

CHAP. VI.

OF CIVILISATION, AND ITS POWER.

WHAT is civilisation? That which enlightens the mind, and at the same time softens the manners. The word is complex; for it is the union of these two conditions which produces perfect civilisation. An enlightened man, with rough and uncultivated manners, (if such a being can possibly exist,) could not be considered as completely civilized. In like manner, a man gifted with great mildness of manners, but destitute of instruction, such as may be found among the natives of some parts of India, (a people whose effeminacy appears to proceed from the weakness of their moral and physical organization:) such a man also has not yet overstepped the threshold of civilisation.

In the general acceptation of the term, we understand by a civilized people, that people, with whom moral cultivation keeps pace with softness of manners, and mildness of the laws;

for a civilized people will never tolerate barbarous laws; the natural effect of civilisation is to abrogate them; the greater the civilisation of a people, the greater their detestation of such laws; for then their deformity is more apparent, and their operation more keenly felt. Civilisation requires harmony to exist between the intelligence, the manners, and the laws of a people; the abolition of confiscation, and that of the *droit d'aubaine*, uniting these three conditions, have been two acts of complete civilization.

What is man? A being endowed with the power and the wish of perfecting his faculties, and of using them to his own advantage: the germ of civilisation lies here. Again, what is man? A being eminently social. He can then apply to the perfecting of society the faculty of perfectibility, which appertains to himself, as he can also in regard to all objects which interest him. Of all interests, society is that by which he is most strongly affected; from this to the constitutional system there is but one step. To man, this should be the first emotion of his mind, the first wish of his heart; to create it his chief occupation; to adopt it when perceived, his strongest tendency. It is thus the world appears in our days,—such is her present aspect.

What is the state of the world? The result of the development of the human mind, produced by three hundred years of labour, all tending towards civilisation.—A grand and complete revolution may be discovered to have begun, even at the commencement of its course, in the sixteenth * century.—The various and important improvements in the arts and sciences, and the mode of living; the immense increase of wealth, and the still greater accumulation of knowledge and intelligence, all forming a mighty confluence, have, under the name of the French Revolution, swept away the old social edifice, like a torrent, and given a new aspect to the state of things. Cries of pain and grief may be heard from beneath its ruins, but the torrent has passed and pursues its course.

France has had the glory of appearing at the

* See Robertson's Introduction to the History of Charles the Vth. This admirable production, emanating from the pen of a man who will certainly not be called *liberal*, at least, without renewing the Fable of the Wolf and the Lamb, "How could I have done it, I was not then born?" is nothing more nor less, than what all enlightened minds have concurred in, that the revolution, very improperly termed *French*, and which should be called the *human revolution*, is the necessary result of the changes which have taken place throughout every class of society within the last three hundred years.

head of this great change; a glory which some have endeavoured to convert into reproach; but let them say on; the universe will thank and avenge her.—In virtue of that rank which France occupies in the intellectual and political world, she has given to this impulse a vast splendour, a prodigious extent, an irresistible rapidity; and such will always be the case with every impulse communicated by such a country: but from whatever place it might have originated, though perhaps with less facility, it would still have attained the same end, and always from the same cause, *civilisation*. If the Reformation had broken out in Paris or in Rome, it would have taken a more rapid course: nevertheless, though born in the recesses of a cloister, in so obscure a city as Wittemburg, it still attained its object.—In this we must acknowledge the force of civilisation, which overcomes all obstacles: the Reformation has been one of the greatest acts, and, at the same time, one of the most powerful vehicles of civilisation. Permit me here to make a comparison: comparisons are very useful in the elucidation of a subject: the revolution has been, in regard to the changes which have taken place in the civilisation of the world, what the Encyclopædia was to the arts and sciences; these were in existence, all that the

Encyclopædia did, was to assemble the different parts, and unite them in one common focus. The revolution has done the same, it has united in the same body, what had been invented by, and scattered throughout all human society during the last three hundred years: in it is found a summary of the three preceding ages.

This conclusion was inevitable from what existed in the bosom of these societies. The world, then, is now submitted to the law of this change, brought about by the power of civilisation, and consequently to civilisation itself: it is its *sujet forcé*. Civilisation has become a necessity, and what has ever prevailed against necessity? Penetrating at the same moment into public and private manners, properly estimating men and things, directing, and vivifying all things, civilisation has become the true soul of the universe, renewed and fostered by its light.

Consider the means and calculate the effects of civilisation: at this moment every thing in the world appertains to, and labours for it, princes, individuals, all are but its servants; they propagate it, without wishing and without perceiving it. Power is an object of desire to

princes, and is necessarily so in order to preserve their lofty state, and prevent them from remaining in a state of inferiority so injurious to them. For this purpose, they call the arts to their assistance; they accumulate riches; favour industry, protect commerce, and introduce improvements into agriculture: here, they found exchanges for merchants; there, museums; superb and opulent cities rise upon the shores, which but a few years since were uninhabited: all the embellishments of advanced civilisation adorn places but lately infested by barbarians: it is in the Crimea, on the banks of the Wolga, that these miracles have been worked. Canals are every where dug, new means of communication are opened; the public ways are covered with the flower of Europe, a population anxious to discover whatever is worthy of being seen or known; the ocean likewise has human inhabitants; every day adds to the intensity and rapidity of this general movement: but what is all this? *Civilisation and the means of civilisation.* But what is the end of this civilisation, and of its progress? Society. This, then, is the final result and the inevitable tendency of all human efforts and exertions. It is towards society that they incline by their very nature.

Modern societies are, then, by their actual constitution, under the inevitable law of an increasing improvement, which is but the development of civilisation. But is not the government of societies the most natural object of all amelioration? It is then the true one to which all the fruits of observation and experience are to be applied. And where would be their use, were they not thus employed? Such experience without such application would only render the disproportion between their powers and actual state more apparent to society, and make the contradiction between the several parts of their existence, more strongly felt.—I demand, how can the Turks be civilized while they are left under the oriental despotism by which they are now governed; or the Indians, while they preserve their difference of castes? You would render them the most unhappy of men: they only endure their present state from their ignorance of a better: open their eyes, let them perceive the abyss into which they have been plunged by barbarous and contradictory institutions, and it would soon be apparent, whether all their efforts would not tend to create harmony between what they know and what they do, between their knowledge and their code. There is no middle course; either the government or civilisation must give way.—It

would be impossible for them to move in two lines parallel, and at the same time diverging from each other. This has been proved:—Peter the First invited civilisation into Russia; and every day diminishes and wears away the props of ancient barbarism. A civilized Russia, on the same footing with the rest of Europe, bursts at once upon us: it is asked, whence is this metamorphosis?—from having opened her gates to civilisation. May Heaven grant to the days of the emperor Alexander a duration equal to that of his renown, as a recompense for the respect for civilisation, with which he has inspired a new people, and for having erected its throne amidst a nation, to which it was yet unknown.—But as the laws of nature forbid the realizing of this event, it may still be hoped that a reign, of which every thing predicts the long continuance, and particularly from its being consecrated to the exercise of the softest and most benignant virtues, will produce in the manners, and perhaps in the government of Russia, an amelioration which nothing can destroy.—For, can it be conceived possible, that a country, once accustomed to civilized habits, could retrograde to those of barbarism? It is contrary to nature, it has never occurred, and never will. It may very easily happen that a country is not civilized, but having once be-

come so, it never can be otherwise. Civilisation cannot be forgotten; history does not furnish one single example of such a retrogradation in a people not conquered and subjected to a religion different from its own: in China three times have the conquerors been vanquished by civilisation. — Wherever she appears, she is equally destructive to the laws as well as to the customs of barbarism, and soon erects her throne upon their ruins.

People acquire civilisation by a thousand methods unconnected with the laws; and she every where introduces a new order of things. For this purpose she equally converts the virtues and the vices of princes to her views; the former are of easy application, and she is a support to them; the latter oblige her to have recourse to violence, and create for themselves all the dangers consequent upon being in contradiction with the state of the world: there is no difference but in the form, the result is precisely similar.

Civilisation then induces the perfection of social order: but does not this order comprise all that interests society; and has society itself a more vital interest than that of the good order of its government? Therefore the last term of civilisation, the point to which she necessarily

returns is social order: it is this that she is incessantly endeavouring to ameliorate and to perfect. Once more, therefore, it is the constitutional, that is to say, the legal, regular system, depending wholly upon regular laws, which is always seen to be the foundation of civilisation, following her progress, and conforming itself to her steps. How can it be possible that men, highly civilized, are not at the same time more abundantly provided with the means of appreciating the principles of social order, more sensible of its defects, and better able to apply a remedy? and when the reunion of these faculties is found amongst men, is it possible that they should not seek to employ them? Can this be conceived? It must be confessed there is manifested a fatal delusion, as well on the part of governments as of individuals, who are enemies to the constitutional system, and the latter are almost all to be found in the higher ranks of society. They wish for arts, for commerce, for riches, for pleasures; and in fact all these are desirable, but they may be all conveyed in one word,—civilisation. But what are the agents of all these means of enjoyment or of power? What have they done? What will they do? To what purposes can they be applied? In order to procure all this, science and labour have been necessary, these have produced wealth: here, then, are men learned and

rich, that is to say, civilized; men like those, to whom they have just furnished the objects of their wishes, and who themselves had not attained the civilisation and rank they occupy by any other means, they are then become similar in every thing to those who have gone before them in the career of civilisation and society.—Well! having arrived at this point, what will be the result? Will they confine themselves to the physical part only of their faculties, as for example, to procure themselves more magnificent habitations, richer habiliments, and more delicate viands? Will they deny themselves the moral part of their advancement in civilisation? Will they have advanced in science to remain stationary in the social system? With all the means of observing, of appreciating, of acting for themselves, will they deny themselves the desire of taking part in what is *doing*, and will they repress those faculties, improved by labour and sustained by wealth, for the purpose of assisting only the purposes of others? In truth this would be inconceivable, it would reverse history altogether, which uniformly proves, that from the creation of the world, every thing in society has formed its level upon that invincible combination,—knowledge and riches, and that towards them has been the uniform progress of nations and individuals.

Such then is the actual state of the world; the French Revolution has indeed proved, that thus it is governed: did not the third estate, as it was called, saturated with knowledge and riches, commence by seizing upon the government? and has not this trial of its strength rendered it conscious of its power? In what has it shewn itself inferior to the classes which had preceded it? All division of civilisation is then against nature itself: it is a folly to wish for it without its effects, to receive the advantages but reject the disadvantages; it must be adopted wholly or not at all; it must be either received or rejected *in toto;* to divide it surpasses mortal power.

It is very apparent, that a purely physical civilisation, which would place science, riches, and their agents at the disposal of government and the nobility, without any propensity on the part of the civilized to raise themselves in the scale of social order, but, on the contrary, a disposition to remain in confirmed subordination, would be much more agreeable to their rulers, whose constant language is, permit us to act, and yourselves to be led, we are the natural leaders. But, unfortunately for them, civilisation is not thus constituted, it will not submit to the convenience of any one: it fol-

lows the laws of its own nature, and is as impatient of restriction as knowledge, the qualities of which it is continually reproducing. A purely physical civilisation has never existed, nor could the most powerful enchanter produce so fantastical a being; but every thing which forms part of this civilisation necessarily attaches itself to social order, by the power of irresistible consequences, gives that direction to human efforts best suited to them, namely, towards the constitutional system; it is a continuous circle, there is no exit from it when once we are within it.—Here some melancholy reflections present themselves, which I must be allowed to indulge in.

We are witnesses of a great and fatal error. On the one side, the governments array one part of their powers against the results of this very civilisation, which, with the other part, and with the most praiseworthy zeal, they endeavour to propagate; private individuals do the same. Both one and the other are seen filling the temple of the arts with their offerings, in order to obtain from the presiding deity the object of their fondest wishes—*Civilisation;* but when its bounties have diffused intelligence and riches in giving the means, and have awakened the desire of being associated with the ruling powers, then

the scene is changed; then procrastination, avowed opposition, absurd schemes of temporary compromise, and finally, accusations even, have been brought against—whom? Those people, those very men, whose civilisation they had so much encouraged, so long as the former were indifferent about applying it to their own advantage, but which they oppose as soon as they perceive its natural workings become manifest in a degree beyond what they desire. This, then, is the snare laid by civilisation for those who arrogate to themselves the exclusive application of its benefits. It does not give that which is suitable to individual interests, but that which is to be found in its own bosom; it presents itself with all its qualities, the first of which is, a desire to put itself upon a level with every thing that will admit of equalisation.

But what must be thought of those men, who perceive nothing in this grand movement of the world,—in this progressive improvement of mankind, but a contest of what they term vulgar pretensions, against what, by the same rule, we might call aristocratical ones? For, with which party does this miserable feeling most generally prevail; with those, who repulse and exclude, or those, who wish to attain the height which the others have reached, the sole

point upon which they are disposed to admit their inferiority to them?

What shall be said of those, who actuated only by interested and party views, will contemplate no part of this grand scene, but the bloody catastrophe, with which it generally terminates; and who obstinately persist in representing this great social reformation in no other light than as the groundwork of those terrific romances, the whole action of which consists of treasons, murders, scaffolds and executions? Miserable and fallacious mode of contemplating an event, the grandeur of which surpasses every thing that the eyes of man have hitherto witnessed! Poor and paltry appreciation of so fruitful a source of instruction and experience; for never were the human faculties developed on so vast a theatre!

We must blush to find such principles stigmatized with such names as *Rebellion, Jacobinism, Liberalism, and others of the same manufacture,* which have been created and repeated by a spirit as haughty as it was ignorant; and which knew not their real signification. And it is thus that a movement, which affects the whole world, is defined by a few coarse and insulting epithets! Those who speak thus, and who thus

wisely steer themselves in the world now forming itself, are like travellers, who, ignorant of the course of the stars, bewilder themselves in the deserts of America; they are in the world, without conceiving what the places contain which they inhabit; and believe that ignorance can be concealed under opprobrious expressions. For myself, I shall speak a far different language, and one, in my opinion, much more favourable to the interests of those whom I address; far from seeking to alarm the powerful of the earth by sinister expositions of the effects of civilisation,—far from inducing them to attempt a partition of it, which it would be impossible to effect; I would say to them: Accept this indivisible civilisation fully and entirely, and with all its consequences: do not hesitate an instant, your dearest interests require it. You have only the choice of marching hand in hand with it, as conquerors towards the amelioration of society, or of following its triumphal car. The direction of the intelligence you have already acquired, the softness of manners introduced amongst you by civilisation, the necessity of adding to your power, lest it remain in a state of inferiority; the love of letters and of arts, which constitute the amusement and charm of your existence, the search after those enjoyments connected with riches,

and the mode of life peculiar to your days, all hurry you along, like a rapid current, towards the increase and the results of that civilisation, which like mistrustful possessors, you appear to enjoy in fear. It reaches you by a thousand channels, which are always open, and always increasing. Look at science descending into all classes of society, even to those ranks into which it had hitherto never penetrated. If want of *civilisation* were the means of ignorance, and of all the contradictions, which have ruled the world, civilisation itself, aided by the intelligence every where diffused, now advances, leaning on its powerful auxiliary; we must accompany it, and submit to the soft and easy yoke of reason, which it substitutes for the oppressive one of ignorance. Appreciate civilisation properly. It is undoubtedly liberal and beneficent. All its acts bring pleasures with them, — its generosity is unbounded; but it also exacts. It claims obedience from those whom it strengthens, and is irritated at the resistance of its favourites; and, above all things, it forbids all choice. It is a jealous God, that admits of no rival. Ask it not to remain stationary. It is already far off, while you are yet making the demand. It possesses an inexhaustible principle of action and reaction. One act leads to another. It is

an immense, inseparable, infinite chain, the first link of which holds to the last, which is also the beginning of a new one, endowed with the same faculty of extension and multiplication. Civilisation represents, in society, the ingenious mechanism, which a skilful hand has introduced into the arts, and which, by a perpetual motion, is in incessant reaction upon itself. By your various relations with society, and by the fulfilment of the duties towards yourself and neighbour, you are continually increasing civilisation, and you pride yourself upon it; for who, in these days, would willingly be considered an enemy to civilisation? And where does the worship which you pay it, and which spreads like a refreshing dew over the earth, find its final application? Is it not in society? Does it not reap the fruits of it? Civilisation, then, is the point towards which your own labours, and those of the whole earth are directed, by uncontrolable necessity; the object of your efforts and your respect. But when society feels itself acted upon by the effects and the continually increasing motives of this civilisation, what will it do? What will you yourselves do with it? When science, which imparts universal knowledge, and riches which inspire independence, have multiplied in the bosom of society, and

have become its habitual condition, will no effect be produced from them? Will they be as though they were not? You might as well assert, that non-existence and existence are adequate to the same effects, or that fire, placed in the midst of inflammable matter, would not act upon it. Society will, therefore, proceed, in every respect, in the same proportion as the progress of civilisation; and it necessarily follows, that, as this progress arrives at the government of societies, as well as at the other parts of them, every step of civilisation inclines men, according to the degree of their intelligence, towards a Government better regulated by laws, having, for their basis, the principles of social order; and, by a necessary consequence, wherever a civilised man is formed, a constitutional man appears. The connexion of these two things is indestructible, and it is from the want of a sufficient observance of this, that so much dissension and angry feeling have arisen. Let us explain theory by examples, and, in order to avoid all prolixity, let us consider, at present, only the amount of the taxes paid by the people: they are immense. In a small country, like England, is raised the sum of two thousand millions of francs, including the poor-rates, besides the accumulation of a debt of nearly 30,000,000,000. This is

enormous, and has the appearance of an eastern tale or fable: it is an Egyptian pyramid of finance. France pays, in all, a contribution of 1000 millions, and is loaded with a debt of 3000 millions. At the death of Louis XIV. only about a century ago, she only possessed a revenue of 110 millions. This may be seen by the state of the finances, in 1710, drawn up by the Comptroller General Desmarets. A few years later, she was indebted to the disgraceful expedient of bankruptcy, and could find no other means of extricating herself, than by the ruin of her population; in so backward a state was civilisation then. And now, the same country prospers under a tenfold burthen, without any addition of territory. Whence does this difference arise? From the miracles of civilisation. The latter has produced wonders in all the arts, which have added to its riches, miracles in science, which have reacted upon the arts, by rendering them more productive, because they have been improved, have become more generally known, more easy, and less expensive. And whence again has this arisen? From that part of moral civilisation which has exposed the bankruptcy of infamy and folly, and has taught, that good faith opens the purses of all, as the contrary closes them. Civilisation has produced innu-

merable writings upon the best method of taxation, and the best system of administration. Adam Smith appeared, and with him the regulator of public fortunes, the guide to those sources, of which we should avail ourselves, and those which we should spare. *He is the Rousseau of social economy.* A thousand others have followed in his track, and, step by step, have arrived at the proof, that the principle of all good in finance, as well as in every other part of administration, lies in publicity. This opinion becomes general. Revolution, which is the passage from secret to public Governments, becomes indispensable, and must be accomplished. And why? If not by means of civilisation, which had brought things to that crisis, when, either itself, the source of order and publicity, or the system of Government, the source of disorder and concealed practices, must give way. Adam Smith has explained the paths of administration, as Newton has those of the heavens, and the progress of political economy has, by means of the school he formed, equalled those which astronomy owed to Newton. Why, alas! did it happen, that these two beacons, of which the one has enlightened the earth, and the other the heavens, did not first appear upon the shores of France?

Every thing, therefore, holds and unites itself to the effects and progress of civilisation. To resist it would be truly childish; to attempt to arrest it, to avoid it, to oppose it, at the point at which things have arrived, would only be to ask for a short reprieve, and to insure a more signal defeat from an exasperated enemy.

A terrible and striking example is now under our observation; instruction springs from every part of it.

Napoleon raises himself amongst men by unusual ways, to the highest throne that has governed the world;—he is the child of civilisation, he owes every thing to it, he has promoted it with all his strength; it appeared that, as if impatient of the tardiness of its steps, he wished to give it wings; miracles of industry and of labour were performed at his command; but by the side of this impulse, he placed barriers, *he* also wanted to make his choice, *he* even suffered the last link of the chain to be perceived; by forming the Polytechnic School, and by subduing nature itself in the great work of the Simplon, he intended also to shackle France. The earth is silent before him, every thing is at his feet, all opposition is supposed at an end: but stop, the power of civilisation will soon be

seen; it has divorced itself from him, he wished to rule it, to be its master, but it will be slave to no one; and, proud and free, it passes like a noble deserter, to his enemies, and infuses into their minds that intelligence, which before they had been deficient in, and places in their hands those very weapons, which had rendered his arm so formidable. As if, by a simultaneous movement, proceeding from their progress in every part of civilisation, England, Russia, Germany, and Sweden consider, interrogate, unite, and feel themselves capable of attacking their haughty adversary. An exquisite feeling of nationality, till then nearly extinguished, arose in the hearts of the people annexed to the dominions of Napoleon;—a formidable attack, directed by their united strength, falls upon him; he fell, and he, who, during so long a period, had been the dictator of Europe, and that, more by his intelligence, than by physical power, uttered this instructive reflection at the moment of his downfall: *I have not been dethroned by the Coalition, but by the force of liberal ideas, that is to say, by civilisation, placed in the hands of the Coalition, rendered strong by it.* If the picture appears fantastical, there is a certain method of placing it in a clear point of view. Transform the scene and the actors; instead of civilized Europeans, increasing daily in civilisation, place

the Turks, confined by their religion to the civilisation of Amurath and Bajazet, and you will then discover, whether Napoleon would have gone to end his days in St. Helena, had he only been opposed by adversaries in the lowest degree of civilisation. This fact it is necessary for us to know, and to profit by it, that Napoleon is the great victim of civilisation, which sacrificed him in revenge for his having differed from it on some points. After this, attempt to oppose or divide it.

I must insist upon this subject, because it is the key to the movement of the universe, and because, almost all the faults that are committed, proceed from its not being sufficiently considered. It is impossible that the name of Louis the XIVth should not often recur, such a space does he occupy in history. An infinity of events date from this illustrious prince; he gave birth to a new era; this justice cannot be refused him. Europe and France are indebted to him for the most brilliant parts of civilisation, but, from the same reason, they also owe to him the greater proportion of the revolutions they have witnessed; he has, without being aware of it, promoted them as much as lay in his power; he thought he was acting only for himself and his own times, but he was acting for her,

and, by the seeds which he scattered, he prepared the way for the change which his throne has undergone. His arts, his festivals, Versailles, Corneille, Racine, Massillon, Molière, were only so many parts of civilisation, and the men, who assisted at these miracles of art and of the mind, were on that account only more fit to be sensible of the deformity of the regency, of the disgrace attached to the disputes of Jansenism, of the immorality of the following reign, and of the miserable nature of the policy and administration of the whole of this period. Can it be supposed, that when Louis extended information, taste, and elegance throughout, that people should not therefore be still more affected by the conflagration of the Palatinate, by the dragoonings, and by the disasters of the Succession War? This would imply too glaring a contradiction, and would impute to the human mind a division, which does not exist, by which it would be clear-sighted on one side, and blind on the other. This is the snare by which all are equally entrapped; they only want a partial civilisation, one that is convenient to themselves, but it is by nature integral; when it discovers itself and acts, it is full and complete. How could it be expected, that, in societies, disposed as French, or, more properly speaking, as European societies have been since

the reign of Louis the XIVth. when one step leads on to another, when Montesquieu, Rousseau, and Voltaire, in the enchanting and invincible alliance of reason, eloquence, and grace, converse with men upon their most important interests, when they clearly develope to them the principles, abuses, duties, and resources of human societies and of governments, how can it be expected that those institutions which oppose them, should maintain themselves; and what fruit can be expected from a struggle against civilisation, when it has reached this point? The Revolution proceeds from it, and many others will be produced by it; it may be reckoned upon. But, as it necessarily ends in the Constitutional System, it is with it as with a port of refuge; to-day, the will alone is sufficient to enable you to enter it, to-morrow, the storm will force you into it; Lisbon, Madrid, and Naples were overcome by it for having procrastinated. When fifty millions of Russians shall have partaken of the civilisation of Europe, by the share which they take in her arts, her affairs, her commerce; by riches, by travels, by the perusal of all the legislative debates that Europe and America present; renewed by all these social improvements, transformed by them into other men, they will either become constitutional, or ice and snow will no longer be found

in Russia. This is the natural result of things, it is in them, I have read it; let not those who differ from my doctrine hastily condemn me. For a long time I have examined very closely, and have proposed this problem to myself: how can civilisation be circumscribed, and how can the effect of its progress be avoided? An invincible force has always brought me back to the same point: *to accept it in toto with all its consequences, or to separate from it entirely, if it be possible.* The Turks, who keep their gates closely barred against civilisation, appear to me more consistent than those Europeans, who only wish to open one half of theirs to it; the moment it procures an inlet, it breaks through every thing, and enters with its whole retinue.

If another solution can be found to this problem, I will accept it upon demonstration; in the meantime, I shall remain firm in the conviction, that the same thing occurs with civilisation as with justice, which, although it travels by short stages, yet ends by arriving at last.

Revolution, civilisation, and human mind, are three synonymous words, three causes and effects. Put any restrictions upon the human mind, and you impede civilisation—men will remain stationary; but if it continue its course,

the world will always proceed with it; and this has been its invariable course since the creation.

If, as must be expected from the number of minds, false in themselves, or interested in corrupting those of others, it should be attempted to weaken what I have advanced, by contrasting the word *civilisation* with the excesses which were committed during the course of the Revolution, and which, in fact, bear very little resemblance to civilisation; I should refer these opponents to that part of Mr. Guizot's work, which treats upon the contradiction of some parts of the Revolution, and which render them so dissimilar to each other. Whoever will not be convinced by the observations contained in that work, is incapable of conviction.

I should then answer, that some miserable creatures, who had, for the most part, arisen from that class of society, which civilisation has not as yet reached, and who, having violently possessed themselves of a power which was not calculated for their coarse hands, proves nothing against my proposition; on the contrary, they are in its favour; their domination was a surprise upon the Revolution and civilisation, which soon drove them back into the filthy holes, from

which they ought never to have issued. Their speedy punishment was the monument of their vengeance. What Frenchman has ever wished to recal these men or these times? Who is there that has not endeavoured to banish the idea of having belonged to them? What is beyond the borders of civilisation cannot be opposed to it: and these men had either left it, or had never entered into it. I would add, that there being nothing absolute or positive among men, they admit the most contradictory things; such times are a semi compound of light and darkness, religion and impiety, softness of manners and ferocity.

The fifteenth and sixteenth centuries are fertile in superior geniuses; observe what an absurd belief, what barbarous prejudices existed in the midst of such brilliant intelligence.

The reigns of Francis II. of Charles IX. of Henry III. and Louis XIII. were the days of religious fervour and devotion; and yet in the midst of them, what impiety, what atrocities, and what manners! Nothing surpasses Louis XIV. and his court, in elegance, in cultivation of the mind, and in religious and civil pomp; and yet these times present us with the conflagration of the Palatinate, the dragoonings,

and the man with the iron mask; and what is most worthy of remark in this, is, that all these enormities pass without animadversion on the part of contemporaries, so great was the dissimilarity between manners and intelligence! Let us here close these observations; they are already too long for those who are convinced of their truth, and who wish to understand them; in such a case, knowledge is the straight road to power.

CHAP. VII.

SEAT OF THE EUROPEAN POWERS; THEIR MODE OF PROCEEDING.

In the commencement of this work, will be found the political and moral Statistics of Europe, and also a true statement of the political forces, and of the moral dispositions of the Continent; but the picture would be incomplete, if I did not now point out the centre of the Powers, which set those forces in motion, as well as the course which the directors of these Powers have followed.

Where do the Powers which direct the forces of Europe reside?—*In the Aristocracy*

The sovereignty exercised by *one* is, by its nature, aristocratical; thrones are essentially so; all men are equally desirous of power, all exercise it, and endeavour to attract it towards themselves, to preserve and extend it. The power of one alone, is aristocracy in the

highest degree, and in proportion as power is most absolute, as it is exclusive, so it approaches more closely to the nature of aristocracy, which is both exclusive and predominating.

Generally speaking, and setting aside all personal considerations, as both duty and delicacy require, it must be allowed that Princes belong to aristocracy, and form a necessary part of it. The Emperor Joseph II. being at Paris, while the disputes between the Court and the Parliament were at their greatest height, gave this answer to one who incautiously questioned him: *As for me, I may certainly be permitted to be rather a royalist, it is my profession.*

Courts are the centre of the aristocracy of nobility; the recruits, with which it is supplied by the inferior ranks, are not slow in following the steps of those, to whose seducing offers they are exposed. Influence soon works upon them; and the newly initiated, flattered, dazzled by their promotion, easily become courtiers; there are few who possess sufficient strength of mind to support the view of a palace, and the caresses of the great, with dignified firmness: it may happen that these new courtiers, in the ardour of imitation, and from anxiety after distinction, may even surpass those who have pre-

ceded them in their career. It was of them that Lafontaine said

> " Cet accident n'est pas nouveau,
> " Dans le chemin de la fortune.*

Throughout all Europe the supreme direction of affairs, and the high posts of Government, have mostly been placed in the hands of the aristocratical classes. But we must do justice to the Government of France; since 1814, this country has shewn less tenacity than others, in adhering, in the composition of her ministry, to a system of preference for those classes which formerly were in possession of it. The upper chambers of all constitutional countries belong to the aristocracy; it is the element of the former, and the property of the latter.

In the most considerable countries, such as France and England, the lower or popular chambers are mostly composed of the aristocracy.

The small states, the remains of ancient feudality, are almost entirely composed of aristocrats.

The legislative power of Europe, in which the sovereignty resides, is therefore almost entirely in the hands of aristocracy.

* This accident is not new in the ways of fortune

The executive power is so still more clearly, for it is wholly and exclusively placed in the hands of the Government; the latter disposes of all which is most interesting to men, honours and emoluments; it admits, excludes, raises, debases, and rejects whatever it thinks proper; its means are infinite and unparallelled; the whole force is on its side, and properly speaking, it is itself, nearly all in all; in societies, which are, in so many points, allied to the Governments, whose interests are so interwoven with their own, it is truly the real master; and when it receives, in addition, the right of negociation without control or participation, I cannot discover what there is wanting to its power. By reflecting upon its vast influence in France, and by examining the anxious throng that always follows in its train, and the thickness of the ranks of these obsequious clients, it may be discovered whether I deceive myself.

The habits of a nation must also be considered; when it has, during a long space of time, contracted the habit of admiring, rather than of reflecting; and of delivering up its affections, rather than arguing upon them; when the Court and the great have, for a long period, concentrated all power and brilliancy

within themselves, these circumstances add greatly to the strength of the restraint under which a nation is held by the Government. It appears difficult to reconcile an extensive Court, a numerous assembly of courtiers, and a long train of aristocratical nobles, haunting the avenues of the palace, with a large portion of liberty in the same country. England has carefully avoided this; and it is perhaps to this, that she is indebted for her liberty. It was the contrary under Charles II., and it is well known what happened—the Revolution of 1688 became necessary to place every thing in its proper position. Since that period, court influence has not been felt in that country, Pitt and Chatham never possessed it; every thing in the political system has occurred in the political arena, between the Government and the Parliaments, they were the only legitimate combatants. Lord Bute, the favourite of George III., could not maintain himself in it. It would be folly to attempt to govern in the midst of opposing influences, and to strive to make the political system bend to individual desires, of whatsoever nature they may be; the Duke Decazes split upon this rock; it is a general rule, that there is but one manner of serving the state, the Prince and one's self well, and that is, to regulate one's self entirely

27474

by circumstances, all personal inclinations being set aside.

Religion comes to strengthen this creed in favour of aristocracy; the Catholic Priest, the child of Rome, and the pupil of Deuteronomy, placed, by the rudiments of his education, more in the midst of the people of God, than of the society, of which he forms a part, obedient to first impressions, with which his mind has been struck, and under a yoke, which his weakness prevent his shaking off,* cannot

* I require no other proof of what I have advanced, than the *Petit Carême* of Massillon. The ardor of disputation, by which some people are carried away, has caused them to introduce the name of this celebrated writer; and whose do they not make free with? The point in question then is to know whether Massillon was a *liberal*. This appeared so singular as to induce me to reperuse this famous *Petit Carême*, and I have discovered in it the character which Marmontel has so well pourtrayed in a piece, on the Eloquence of Father Bridaine:

Ce style ingénieux et tendre,
Qui semble attacher l'âme au plaisir de l' entendre,
Ce langage épuré qu'une touchante voix
Parlait si doucement à l' oreille des rois.*

On this second perusal, I again experienced the same charm of this enchanting style, which I felt when reading this work for the first time in the spring of my youth, a work so

* The ingenious and tender style, which appeared to endear the soul to the pleasure of listening to it, and the pure language, which was poured so softly into the ears of kings, by the affecting tones of the voice.

abstain from transferring his first ideas of the Divine system into that of purely political societies; he always perceives David's throne in those of the earth; in the anointed princes of

well adapted to gain so great an influence over the heart, the innate sensibility of which, has not yet been ruffled by the troubles of life. How sweet are the tears which flow on perusing the affecting farewell pronounced in the Easter sermon, when the eloquent orator, appearing for the last time before his royal auditor, seems to have brought forth all the treasures of his genius and his feelings, to interest Heaven forcibly in favor of the child, another Joas, upon whose heart he had endeavoured to engrave the principles of the Divine law, in order to prepare him for the government of France! It is impossible to imagine any thing more affecting or more admirable.

As to the point at issue, the case is very different. Long discussions have now enlightened our minds with respect to the notions of political rights, and we perceive that those of the prelate upon this subject, were not clear or perspicuous. He passes continually from Divine right to the rights of the people, from absolute power to liberty, from the concession of the throne of France by the people, to the imposition of it by God himself, so as to demonstrate clearly, that if he were the *Racine* of the pulpit, he was not the *Montesquieu* of the Civilians. In this same perusal we are continually struck with the repetition of the grandeur *of the Prince's birth*, which is always qualified by him *as the most illustrious of the universe*, and by *the praises of his dawning beauty*. The two last qualifications are placed foremost in almost all his discourses. Thus the *liberalism* of Massillon is strongly tainted with aristocracy, and accords but little with the Gospel.

He often lets slip phrases, which would excite the most lively clamors in our days, as, in the Sermon on the second Sunday of Lent, in addressing himself to the great, and speak-

the Lord, the image of the Divinity, but not the representative of human societies; and into the error of this pious transformation, he is led by the very nature of his chief, in whom

ing of other men, he says: *they are born to suffer, to bear the weight of the heat and of the day, in order to contribute, by their labour and the sweat of their brow, to your pleasures and profusion, and to drag, if I may thus express myself, the car of your pleasures and your indolence.* It is said in the Sermon on the 3rd Sunday, *Kings are but the leaders of the people.* But what would in our days, be said to the writer, who should dare to utter the following words, which are to be found in the Sermon on the day of the Incarnation: *and yet the great bear the pride of their origin stamped upon their foreheads; they reckon the degrees of their grandeur by ages which are no more, by dignities which they no longer possess, by actions in which they have not participated, by ancestors, whose remains are but vile dust, by monuments, which time has effaced, and they believe themselves superior to other men, because they can shew more domestic wrecks of the rapidity of ages, and can produce more proofs of the vanity of human things than others.* Strike out the name of Massillon and you will hear people exclaim on the perusal of this diatribe, *what democrat uttered this?* It would be the same with the Philippic against the war, which is seen in the Sermon on Christmas day: this morceau is very effective, but we can hardly believe, that it was delivered before Lewis XIV.; it is true, it was in presence of Lewis the XIV. unfortunate and vanquished. And notwithstanding, the same man, who has thus reprimanded the great and lowered their pride, speaks of their followers in these terms: *how dearly do not those unfortunate creatures pay for your pleasures, who absent from your eyes, and seeking to fill up the leisure time which your amusements afford them, feel themselves authorised, by your examples to indulge in those unruly inclinations which they derive*

he perceives a living and personified theocracy. How should men, thus disposed, not adhere to aristocracy, nor devote their talents to its service? It is also a problem, which time only can solve, to know, how far Catholic priests could satisfy themselves with such a system of political freedom, as civilisation introduces into the new world, of which it has possessed itself. The efforts they continually make in France against its establishment, the activity they have exerted against it in Spain, the difficulties which some part of the Clergy of Belgium, and almost the whole of that of Ireland, have started upon subjects apparently little susceptible of them, raise ideas but little favourable to the assistance which the Catholic Clergy in general and as a body, may be expected to afford to liberty. Aristocracy is well aware of it, and it is there, may be found a key to the secret, of the predilection which it shews for the Clergy; it is not the holy thing, but the auxiliary that it seeks to strengthen.

from the baseness of their education and from a vile and despicable blood!—Petit Carême, Sermon on the Vices and Virtues of the Great.

People would certainly carefully avoid drawing such a picture in our days; the fault does not lie with Massillon, he spoke in the spirit of the times; but a view of these quotations will furnish nothing less than evidence that this illustrious Orator, was far from having just notions upon those questions, with which every one is now acquainted.

Thus the aristocracy draws from a source from which all others are excluded. By continuing to trace the chain of powers by which social order is maintained in every country, aristocracy is to be found in the first rank. The principal places are every where assigned to it: *for the proof of this, it is only necessary to consult the royal almanacs.* The superior part of the principal force, *which is the military,* is the appendage of aristocracy. It is divided in France, in consequence of the efforts of the Revolution, which it was impossible not to notice; but the return to the aristocratical system is distinctly perceptible, and aristocracy has been seen to exert all its influence against the law of recruiting. Aristocracy participates in the superior offices of administration, it descends even to the inferior ones; Mayoralties, Sub-prefectures, general Secretaryships, are no longer objects of its contempt; admonished by its love of power and by the want of it, it has abandoned its propensities, for the desire after domination. Formerly, it threw only looks of contempt on finances and only sought their fruits by interested alliances; now, it does not hesitate to be identified with them.

The superior tribunals are generally inclined towards aristocracy; the idea of a thing,

that does not naturally belong to them, has taken root in the midst of these bodies; they are as much in favor of it, as the bar is inclined towards democracy. These two fractional parts of judicature present the image of two chambers, the one aristocratic, the other democratic: this short analysis of the classing of powers, suffices to indicate their actual seat in Europe. *It is in the aristocracy;* every thing else, with a few exceptions, is but its instrument, and as the inferior degrees are in a thousand ways dependant on the superior—as the action of these is only exerted in a lower region—as they neither dispose of any thing that is lucrative or attractive—this exception from aristocracy must be considered as unimportant, so that it is impossible, not to perceive that the totality of European societies is governed by aristocracy; it is aristocracy which makes laws and carries them into execution, and consequently, it is aristocracy which rules.

And now, what is the necessary result of this pre-eminence? The wise man has said, a man is known by those with whom he associates. Chemistry says, "Give me the elements of a body, and I will assign its place in the class of beings." The same thing happens here. Aristocracy is thus in possession of the superior

powers. What will it do with them, and with liberty? Will it share it with others? This would be novel. It will infallibly act in its own favour, by consulting only its own nature.

Examine the degrading system pursued for the last few years, and you will recognize its handy-work.

Napoleon inspired much fear, and did much injury to many Princes. The people came to their assistance, and, in some instances, forced them to accept their aid, and he was overthrown. Such a service could not pass without some marks of gratitude: it deserved reward. Institutions are, therefore, promised. The Congress of Vienna announces States for all parts of Germany, Constitutions are declared in some places, the day for their promulgation is appointed,* and for a long time it was said, that every thing should be regulated according to the intelligence and

* Edict of the King of Prussia, on the 22d May, 1815, declaring, that a Constitution should be formed, that a Representation of the people should be instituted, and that the Deputies of all the provinces should assemble at Berlin, on the 1st of September, of the same year, and should confer with the public functionaries, whom the King would appoint to form a constitutional charter. The sense of this is clear.

state of the age. At Carlsbad, States were promised, but they were to be historical, namely, aristocratical. At Laybach, the only question discussed, was that of monarchical principles; and the whole farce is concluded, by giving to Naples Councils, appointed by the King, and something like the provincial assemblies that preceded the States General. Thus has the gradual depression been effected, which has brought us from 1815 to the point at which we are now arrived. The clue is in our hands.

In 1814 and 1815, the high Allies supported the constitutional tendency. For four years, they manifested a disinclination for the aristocratical tendency; but, since the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, their route is changed. Here are many hopes frustrated, many retrograde motions. Whence does this arise? From the predominance of aristocracy. We must always ascend to the source of things. Of what persons are the Councils composed? who is heard, and who decides in them? And here I cannot help repeating what I wrote in the second part of my *Considerations on the Congress of Carlsbad; of Princes of high nobility; of noble and most noble Ministers; of eminently noble mediatised powers; all the Chiefs*

of noble Governments also; all forming, with the nobles, a chain of interested individuals; that is to say, aristocracy in its superior degrees. This rules every thing. Do we see the dissenting parties, do we see disinterested men summoned? Does any regular discussion exist? Is it even possible to be heard, and has Naples been so? What do these meetings and these decisions present? An assembly of men, who endeavour to propagate the opinions which they have imbibed, who do not meet for the purpose of enlightening themselves by discussion; but of fortifying themselves in a method of viewing things which were previously settled, and, if it may be so expressed, of sharpening their intellects, by mutual collision. Tell me, then, what an assembly is composed of, and I will immediately tell you what it will do. Unite a hundred parliament men and a hundred colonists; give them power, and you will have parliaments, and an expedition fitted out against St. Domingo. When, in 1815, three hundred emigrants, Vendean and Condean nobles, were, very imprudently, permitted to enter the legislative chamber, all that followed was manifest to the eye of every one who was not ignorant, that the resolutions of bodies follow the principles of their composition:

and when the new law of election made its appearance in 1820, what has since happened since was clearly foreseen. But how has all this occurred alike in Germany and France, and every where else? From the dominion of aristocracy. It does not rule in America, or in Spain, or Portugal, and therefore nothing of the kind is seen there.

What we have advanced with respect to the occupation of the European powers by aristocracy, and to the direction which it has given them, is therefore an evident and incontestable truth, a *material fact*, which must strike the eyes of the least clear-sighted.

It was necessary for me to say this, for I am treating on the state of Europe; and it would be better to say nothing, than not to begin by well determining the state of the subject which is to be examined. This state is now ascertained; and certain, that it is a positive fact, we may proceed with a firm step, the ground is well known;—dissipate every thing that is vague, fix your questions well, and disputes must become impossible.

Here a new question presents itself.

Is this pre-eminence of aristocracy in harmony with the present state of civilisation, or in other words with that of the world? This is a very complicated question; the following Chapters will assist us in its solution.

CHAP. VIII.

NON-CONFORMING EUROPE. PROVISIONAL EUROPE. PERPLEXITY OF THE EUROPEANS.

I follow the example of seamen, and advance with the lead in my hand; for like them, I must examine shores, the situation and bearings of which, having been imperfectly explored, I am desirous of publishing correctly.

Moreover, the subject is of a very serious nature, for the question relates to the just appreciation of many things connected with the state of France and of Europe, and also to the consequences that cannot fail to ensue from every false appreciation. A great number of mistakes have already been made; their consequences have been severe, and we must endeavour not to fall into the same difficulty. A shelter cannot be found against the disagreeable effects of the latter, by listening to only two classes of men, of which the one says to us, "Let us have our own way, the helm is in our hands, sleep in peace." Ah! from what hands has not this rudder sometimes escaped, and

when have we slept.—Whilst the other class are anxious to persuade us, that the surrender of powers into their hands is sufficient for the settlement of every thing.

I, who find much difficulty in believing that a whole world, that has been convulsed for thirty years, can re-compose itself in a day, or by virtue of a few words only, must find another basis for the work in which I am engaged; and must seek for it out of the beaten track. Of what advantage would be the presence of one traveller more on the same road? There are already but too many, generalities have been exhausted, the repetition of them has rendered them wearisome, they have been discarded, in order to direct the fatigued attention to other objects. It is the positive, the present, that which relates to ourselves, that is required; this direction is at once sound and legitimate. This is an additional merit in Mr. Guizot's works; he has placed us opposite to ourselves, in the centre of our own position, and has by this judicious choice, added to his success, which is already so well deserved. Madame de Staël has risen and hovered in the lofty region of general considerations, though the elevation of her flight has not diminished her claims to the admiration which is decidedly her due: but

she interests us less strongly by keeping at a distance from us, and in a world, to which we are unaccustomed. There is but little in her writings that is capable of a direct application to our state. And it is those things, which may be directly applied to our situation, and which may produce a proper elucidation of it, that I have made the object of my researches.

In the work upon *Europe and America in* 1820, chap. vi. page 67, I presented the picture of the general and particular divisions, which formed two opposing parties out of the body of Europe, under all the relations of social order; and also that of Europe and America, opposed to each other by grand divisions of Republics and Monarchies: the one is entirely in the Republican system, and the other in the monarchical. I now pursue the same plan. The general division is that, which results from the constitutional system, which rules one part, and from absolute powers, which govern the other; they are two zones of sociability, completely different, and always in view of each other.

The constitutional line extends from Stockholm to Cadiz, through Warsaw, leaving behind it Sweden, Norway, England, Holland, France,

Southern Germany, Switzerland, Spain and Portugal. There exist within this enclosure from seventy-eight to eighty millions of inhabitants, for, I do not reckon the Turks as Europeans; Naples also lately formed a part of it.

The line of absolute power extends from Copenhagen to the extremity of Sicily, and reaches as far as the Volga and the Black Sea: Russia in Asia does not enter into my calculation: this division may also contain eighty millions of inhabitants. If it has the advantage in the number of its inhabitants, this inequality is compensated by the quality of the inhabitants, and the habitations of the first division; France and England being, in many respects, superior to the Hungarians, the Bohemians, to the general classes of Russians, to Russia, to Prussia, and to a considerable portion of the Austrian territories; in every calculation, we must take all things into consideration.

The first reflexion arising from these two great divisions is, that the whole of the *West* of Europe belongs to the Constitutional System, and the *East* to absolute powers. In such a state of things we may imagine the West freed from the despotism, which has so long oppressed

it, driving it towards the East from whence it came, and forcing it back to its birth-place. Take a geographical map and you may easily follow, from the borders of France and England, the line of liberty, which decreases as you approach towards Asia;* it was from this land of slavery that it first burst upon the world:—may it be for ever exiled there! or rather, with more philanthropy, let us hope that it may be banished thence, as well as from the rest of the world, and its very name abolished throughout the universe!

It must be observed, that the constitutional division contains that which may be termed the great manufactory of the civilization of the world, and that the masters of all the sciences, of the arts, the patterns of every species of industry, are to be found in it, accompanied by the attractions of climate and by social enjoyments. The despotic division will require a long time to equal that privileged division; for

* I am astonished that in Paris, the first city in the universe for possessing the talent of *l'apropos*, no map, which might be called constitutional, and which could correctly represent to the eye this division of Europe, has yet appeared. Nothing is more capable of fixing the ideas than to make them sensible to the sight. Horace says:

> Segniùs irritant animos demissa per aures,
> Quàm quæ sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus.

many ages to come, it will only imitate and follow the other at a distance. And what is beyond the efforts of human power, it will never possess, its climate and its productions; the moral superiority of the first division will, therefore be always very great.

But this division itself, although alike under the title of Constitutional, is dissimilar in a thousand other respects. What is complete in one place, is only begun in another; in some places they assemble every year, in others only every two or three years; in some they speak aloud, in others in whispers; in some they assemble in several legislative divisions, in others only in two, or even in one only:—a longer enumeration would be superfluous. This is sufficient to indicate the state of things, and to explain my idea. This disorder is the cause why Europe, instead of presenting the appearance of a perfect building, exhibits only that of an immense deal yard, in which a great quantity of materials await the hand of the workman, to class and place them in regular order. Social Europe is still *sur le chantier*.

This fundamental consideration led me to conclude in my work of *Europe and America in* 1820, that there existed as yet only a provi-

sional Europe, and that definitive Europe, which is the result of the springs of actual civilization, would belong to later days. What I then expressed as the effect of a first observation, has, upon reflexion, acquired the truth of a demonstration. Experience strengthens it at the present time, for, a few days after I had written it, we saw the King of Sweden desire the legislative body of Norway, to revise the fundamental law; this prince, who shews himself as consummate in the art of maintaining himself upon the throne, and of guiding a nation, as he had proved himself gifted by nature with the talent of commanding an army, has, by this act, commenced those successive alterations, which will, in their turn, generalize changes in every country, from whence the uniformity of the constitutional whole will result, that will govern Europe. This result is inevitable, because the cause is uniform, and is always acting, and this cause is civilization, which, being every where gifted with the same attributes, is always present to the people, makes them read in the bosoms of each other, reveals to them every thing that occurs in the midst of them, and excites in them the desire of imitating and appropriating to themselves every thing they perceive that can be useful to them;—this civilisation will act in the system

of governments as it does in the arts and sciences and in commerce; and is not every thing that is found *good* in one country, directly adopted and reproduced in another? Does not civilisation immediately find the means for it, and why should it not do the same in the constitutional system? Who could prevent it? Has man then an *appetite* only for things purely material, and is he wholly indifferent about things of another order, but which, notwithstanding, interest him, in proportion to their vast importance? This cannot be, so long as there remain but *one* human heart, and *one* human mind. Thus the regularity of the principles of the elective system, which are now fixed in theory, but are often much disfigured in practice, and their sincere execution in some countries, will render the elections in rotten boroughs, for instance, so frightful, I had nearly said, so ridiculous, that their abolition will, in a short time, be inevitable. Admire in this the boon of civilisation, be thankful for it, and learn to obey it;—it brings men nearer to each other, it keeps them in a continual state of reciprocal comparison, and of instruction, nothing which this examination has stamped with reprobation can be maintained, nothing it has sanctioned and legitimatized, can perish or be rejected. By it, every door will, in the end, close itself against

evil, or open itself to good. Would it be possible, that, by its means, the chambers of France, of England, and Holland, notwithstanding their dissimilarity and their numerous defects, should not finally dissolve the single chambers of Spain and Portugal? And how would this be effected? By violence? No: by their presence alone, by the discussions which will take place in them on the partition of legislative power, by the communications established between those countries; in a word, by the simple effect of civilisation. Can it be believed, that the presence of better poised powers, and the feeling of the advantages which result from this superior combination, would never induce Spain and Portugal to reflect, to compare, and to acknowledge the defects of their legislative organisation, and to correct it according to those models which have stood the test of time and experience? In order that these anticipated and pacific improvements may take place, I only ask one single thing, namely, that these two countries, by not separating themselves from the rest of the world by a new Chinese wall, continue to remain in connexion with civilized Europe.—It is there that the principle of their reform is to be found, and which they will no more be able to escape, than they have escaped civilisation; the motive for the revision of their condition is the

same as that which led them to the revolution.

The same will happen with the whole of Europe. Its present state is provisional: time will bring it to a definitive system, which will be the consequence of the successive alterations which will be adopted in every place in imitation of one another. The natural inclination of things will bring it about, reformations will be made in the same manner that we assemble together now, the alterations will correspond with each other, and when they are completed, the only circumstance that will excite astonishment, will be, that they have ever been required. The King of Sweden has given a great, a salutary, and consolatory lesson to Europe, by giving the signal for a great enquiry into the state of his country.

I now proceed to the third article, which relates to the necessary effects of the contradiction we have remarked between the different European societies, which are governed by principles exclusive of each other. These effects manifest themselves by the confusion, which so direct a contradiction cannot fail to produce on the minds and in the tendency of men, who endeavour to discover fixed principles by which

to guide themselves. In similar things, men cannot guide themselves by different principles. There must be uniformity where system and stability are required.

There are three things which are most important to man, in the system of certainties, that ought to regulate his conduct; 1st, those which regard religion; 2d, morality; and 3d, social order.

By the first, he is fully aware that he cannot disengage himself from the necessary relations that exist between God and himself; by this he will be led to the knowledge and practice of the duties that flow from a clear conception of this truth.

By the second, he knows, without doubt or hesitation, his duties to his neighbours.

By the third, he learns the relation in which he stands to society, and society to him; the situation which he fills in it; the rights which he exercises over it, and which, in turn, it has over him, that is to say, his duties. The two first articles are invariable, and are no more susceptible of division or extinction than the laws of physics themselves. There, every

thing is clear and determined. The third ought to be placed in the same position, for the nature of society is as unchangeable as that of its author, of the Divinity himself, or as the unalterable principles of morality. It is always universally acknowledged as a truth, that the worship of the Divinity is indispensable, even though the form may be defective. It will always be acknowledged in every place, that lying, stealing, and injuring others, are crimes; that equity and benevolence are virtues. Why, then, should not human societies be considered in the same light? There is also a fixed principle to be found in them, that of the source of power, belonging to and proceeding from the society; so, by the nature of things, there is a certain and determined end, which is, and cannot be other than the welfare of society. It follows, that there ought also to be one fixed principle in the mode of action, and that one thing, which is universally the same in its essence and in its end, ought to be governed by one uniform principle; and yet it is upon this principle that the most formal, as well as the most offensive contradiction, has been established, and which is, on that account, the most likely to disturb both the minds of men, and with them society itself.

Previous to the Revolution, England was the only monarchical country in Europe, in which the principles of social order were recognised and proclaimed, the only one in which the rights of social men were prescribed in the public laws, and served as a rule to legislation. Since the declaration of rights, and the Revolution of 1688, the principles have been recognized and ascertained; a participation of power has been apportioned to each, and its principal basis firmly laid; that basis to which every thing relates, which was so long buried under religious and despotic prejudices; that which expresses this fundamental truth of social order and of human nature, *that society is the source of all power, that every thing is derived from it, that every thing relates to it, that it possesses the right of regulating all its internal affairs to its best advantage, by the organs instituted by the laws, and acting in its name, conformably to them. This is the social contract put in motion.* Rousseau has only placed this doctrine in its proper light, and lent it the magical power of his genius. But this doctrine had not crossed the sea in practice; it was confined to the other side of the Channel; even then it slept, as it were, in books, and acted only upon some minds. It was then only under the bushel, but now it is on the

candlestick, and as if upon a throne. What an immense difference is to be observed between that period and the one in which we live! Follow me, I pray. Sweden and Norway have joined themselves to England. In those countries, the Prince is not afraid of pronouncing the words *contract and compact*, which were formerly unknown, and which are still odious and terrible in so many places. The kingdom of Holland possesses its written fundamental law. It is discussed, accepted. It regulates every thing, and is laid on the basis of the true principles of social order. These principles have become common throughout the whole nation in France. They extend themselves with the renewing of generations, which rise purified from those prejudices which obscured the sight of their ancestors. The legislative discussions, by recurring continually to social principles, enforce them upon the public mind. All the veils, that interested desires of concealment would wish to draw over it, are thrown aside more and more every day. The whole apparatus of divine right is fallen into disrepute; even Spain and Portugal reject it.

Thus is one-half of Europe under one law; but, by what law is the other half governed?

By one totally different. And of what nature is the subject of this law? The same. The two parties are also continually in each other's presence, and in view of each other. By pursuing this examination, the same contradiction will be found to be universally established.

In one of these divisions, it is publicly taught, it is a fundamental law, an uncontested and incontestable practice, that the taxes cannot be collected but by free concession, and according to legal forms; that they are placed in responsible hands, and are watched in their progress, from the time of their entry into the treasury, until their departure thence. Nor is it less solemnly acknowledged in those places, that no citizen can be deprived of his liberty, but according to the forms prescribed by law, and that the superior agents of the throne are responsible, with their heads, for the just observance of this law. In the opposite division, an edict imposes and disposes of taxes. An order of the police arrests the body for a limited or an unlimited term, with or without form. In the one place, thought is considered as a sovereign, who can exhibit himself, and shew his power; in the other, it is a slave, who cannot move a step without dragging his chain after him, which always recalls to him

the feeling of his dependence; but, in both cases, the subject is the same. He is still social man, and yet the principles and the results are to be found at an infinite distance, at the two opposite poles of social order. What effect can this spectacle, which confounds the mind, produce upon the Europeans, who witness this radical contradiction? How can a man decide, to whom a thing is shewn at the same time good and bad? What colour can be ascribed to a thing which is, in the same moment, said to be white and black? The reasoning faculties of a child, which should be thus treated, would be bewildered. These can only be strengthened by the unmoveableness of ideas and of objects; but what can be depended upon, when they change and mutually exclude each other? The perplexity is redoubled by the importance of the actors, as well as by that of the objects in contradiction. Here they are societies and their chiefs; there can be nothing more grand than these. To whom should the best-intentioned man address himself? He is in search of a fixed rule, and he meets with nothing but subjects of dispute, on the part of those by whom he expects to be guided. We have just had a most serious example of this.

Four Sovereigns, assembled at Troppau and at Laybach, either in person or by their Ministers, published a declaration relative to Naples. This bears upon the principles relating to social rights of nations, with regard to each other. What is the consequence? Another Sovereign, the King of England, the ally of the others, contradicts them in the face of Europe, in an official dispatch, addressed to his Ministers, at their own, and all the other Courts of Europe. One of the Ministers of this King goes still further,* for he declared in the House of Lords, *that no one could be more averse than himself, to the general principles laid down by the Allies; and that the publication of that declaration was most impolitic and ill-conceived, on the part of the allied Sovereigns.*

In the midst of this contradiction, I should be glad to know, what system of ideas, or what line of conduct, a man is to follow, who honestly seeks the enlightened path required by an honourable and sensible man. Here are two authorities, which are equally respectable in his eyes, their source and the appearances being the same; and yet the opinion of the one is in diametrical opposition to that of the

* Lord Liverpool's speech, in the House of Lords, on the 3d of March, 1821.

other. But it becomes still worse, when Sovereigns think proper to appeal formally to divine right, which, they say, is their indisputable attribute; whilst, in the one-half of Europe, social right is the sole object of consideration, and in the other a subject of mere ridicule.

On the occasion of the trial of the Queen of England, in 1820, one-half of the English Episcopacy supported the prohibition of divorce by the divine law, and the other maintained the non-prohibition, under the same law. Thus did a spirit of contradiction appear to have crept into the sanctuary, as well as into the cabinet; and whom should the flocks of these discordant pastors believe? The same case occurs in politics. Whom are we to look up to, when the chiefs of the nations are divided on the same topics, and when one half of Europe rejects principles, which the other accepts and places at the head of its institutions? Such is, however, the situation in which we are placed, and which the nonconformity of Europe maintains. We must now examine the means of extricating ourselves from this confusion.

CHAP. IX.

METHOD OF EXTRICATION.

When two guides differ as to the right direction of a road, how must the traveller act to prevent his going astray? He must examine for himself, and do that which reason dictates.

Let us set out upon the same plan. What must we consider? what refer to? To principles and to them alone. What right do we possess? To consult our reason; this is the primitive guide, the light granted us by the Creator; those who pretend to guide us possess no other. When therefore they do not agree amongst themselves, and when their doctrines are in contradiction to each other, what can we reasonably look up to? Are we not then obliged to apply to ourselves and to seek within our own breast for that light which is extinguished, where we had a right to expect to find it? Our rights are created by our wants, and as we cannot be deprived of the latter, there must

always be some means present to satisfy them. Where then are these means to be found? In our reason, which, if faithfully consulted and permitted to act with its native purity, will guide us with perfect safety. It is a mirror which clearly reflects objects when the breath of passion or of interest does not tarnish its surface, nor interpose clouds between it and them.

But on which side is reason to take its stand; should it be on that, which exhibits human societies as an assemblage of individuals, collected together within sight of their best interests and referring them to all the motions and attributes of this society, or should they be abandoned to the exclusive direction of those chiefs whom an infinity of circumstances have constituted their masters, and who appear at their head under a thousand different forms? which is the code that best fulfils the end and purpose of society? This is the whole question.

Could I suppose that even a moment's hesitation could exist on the part of reason, in choosing between two such systems, I should consider myself guilty of insult to the dignity of

the human species, to the rectitude of that reason which Heaven has given as our distinctive mark among all created beings, which are equally the work of its hands. When they are therefore at issue, reason is then to make its choice, to decide between the contending parties, to separate them and to trace out its own path, but whom is it to seek and to accept as a guide? Principles alone. This guide is always sure and always consistent; and this fixedness of principle is well calculated for introducing itself into the mind of man, for establishing itself there, and restraining him in the struggle of its passions, as the anchor holds the ship, amid the fury of the winds.

The declaration of Troppau sets forth doctrines of the greatest importance to the order of societies, the King of England formally contradicts them. What is to be done in such a case? We must apply to reason, that is to say, we must compare the arguments of the two parties on the principles of social order, and then range ourselves on that side which appears the best. This is the only sure path, the only one which is exempt from that species of objection, which always ends by causing the most serious hindrances; hence it

manifestly appears, that reason is, in the end, the judge, and guide of all, the common and universal umpire, to whose tribunal we must always recur and refer every thing. Would to Heaven that no other had ever been acknowledged!

CHAP. X.

HAS THE CONSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM RETROGRADED IN 1821?

THERE are two things which must be taken into consideration, 1st, the constitutional establishments, and 2dly, the constitutional spirit and tendency. These are two very distinct objects. The number of the former, as considered apart, would neither be a sufficient nor a certain criterion; for supposing, by way of example, that the number of these establishments had been diminished, but that there had been an increase in the spirit, tending towards them, the increase of the moral part would compensate for the loss of the material; in order, therefore, to decide this question properly, it is necessary to unite these two objects under one point of view, and to draw the definitive conclusion only according to the rule observed in arithmetical calculations, where the totals are formed by the union of all the different quantities.

The Constitutional System in Europe, has

lost no other territory than that of Naples, but it has gained on the side of Greece, the movement of which proceeds from the constitutional spirit, both by the nature of the contest, and the intentions of the contending parties, which are entirely directed toward this system.

In America, the Constitutional System has gained the Brazils, Mexico, and the Floridas, by their incorporation with the United States. It has strengthened and developed itself in the great republic of Colombia.

With respect to the moral part, so far from losing, the constitutional system, on the contrary, has profited by means of its duration. It encreases in strength, as it does in years, it is continually enriching itself, and forms part of the body of the State; it enters into all its acts, into all its interests, even into those of the citizens;—it may be compared to gold, which penetrates a mass of silver and deprives it of its colour, in order to lend it the brilliancy of its own.

The same occurs in this instance; every year, every day, identifies the constitutional system with the State itself, renders them more and

more inseparable; and, by a natural consequence, imparts to the first, the stability of the second. Habit afterwards contributes its portion; it is this institution which has given to the mind of man at all times, and in all countries, those various forms it has been seen to assume, and of which it is not afterwards deprived without great difficulty: some idea may be formed of this by the obstinacy with which nations are seen to defend customs, as injurious as they are absurd, which they have adopted without reflection, and retain, not from reason, but habit, and solely, because they are accustomed to them. Every nation has begun by passing through the same crucible; when therefore the Constitutional System has endured, we may reasonably conclude that it will continue, and that its past duration will become the cause of its future permanency.

But what adds, beyond all calculation, to the increase of the Constitutional System, is the spirit of the same nature which fills the bosoms of all classes of the inhabitants of Europe. It is the same every where.

With respect to Naples and Piedmont, it cannot be questioned: those two countries have given proofs of it. It is as clear as the

sun at noon day, that the dispositions of the whole of Italy, coincide with those which have burst forth in the two places above-mentioned, and that, were she freed from the oppression of foreign troops, and enabled to express her internal wishes, the Constitutional System would be instantaneously proclaimed from the Alps to the Faro of Messina. Interested feelings, or the want of common sense, or the mania of disputing against demonstrative proof, could alone raise any opposition to truths so palpable as these.

As to Germany, we have an equal body of evidence; with respect to her we must submit to what is said and done, for it cannot be prevented. But as we are not obliged to adopt the errors of others, merely because we are not strong enough to repel or silence them, we must know, how to penetrate fallacious appearances, in order to arrive at the reality; the truth is, that Germany is wholly and entirely constitutional, and that there is no country in Europe, so favourable to the Constitutional System as this, or so anxious to realize its effects. On examining the occurrences in this country, we find the governments occupied in repressing this spirit, and restraining its impatience; this is now their principal care, and the

object of their most anxious solicitude. In his famous letter to the Count de Berstett, the Baden minister, some expressions have escaped M. de Metternich, which betray the secret of the embarrassment and alarm, which have been caused by the establishment of three constitutions in the south of Germany; these establishments were a surprise upon *the absolute system*, a grievous diminution of the military system, which those who exercise it, think it very convenient to retain, and the suppression of which alarms them, on account of the apprehension of the comparison, and of the consequent deductions therefrom. It must be a matter of the most jealous regret to Austria, to see the Constitutional System established at her very gates, in the midst of the labyrinth of laws that govern her possessions, which are as much divided by their modes of government as by their population, their language and their climate.

The Courts in the North of Germany, and particularly the one which had solemnly engaged itself to grant a Constitution to its country, are equally active in using coercive influence over those minor Powers who had manifested an intention of yielding to the wishes of the people, for obtaining a consti-

tutional Government. It is thus that all that has taken place in Saxony, in Hessen, at Darmstadt, and many other places, must be explained. The inclination of the Princes and the people were in favour of the constitutional system, but they have been repressed by Court influence. It has remained suspended between promises and wishes, nor is it too much to add, and discontent. But the repression of these wishes of this constitutional spirit, does not destroy them in those places where they have been observed. Far from it. This spirit exists there, and fortifies itself by those very obstacles that are opposed to it. Like water, it saps the foundation that it cannot shake. It increases by every progress of civilisation; for it is the latter which, under the title of constitutional system, strives to put itself in motion, and to attain reality and political existence. It is civilisation that is always encountered, and which people always mistake. This civilisation is promoted with all their power; but it no sooner exhibits itself in the form which it necessarily assumes, than they recoil from its effects. The sciences improve, intelligence spreads itself every where, riches are increased, industry developes itself; communications improve in activity, in facility, and in rapidity; commerce unites all the parts

of the world together, by new and more extended relations. A great part of this advancement is the laudable work of the Governments. It is impossible, in the nature of things, that all these excitements should remain, without producing their effects; and when these effects discover themselves, then they become the object against which all power is directed. They not only recoil before the work of their own hands, but they do still more, they accuse it. They wish that men, whom they have made *different*, should remain *the same;* and when they show themselves such as others have contributed to form them, then they are condemned for it. They are proclaimed as *factious men, bad subjects, and liberals.* How is this to be conceived? How is such a proceeding to be explained? What reason is to be found, in desiring that men should, at the same time, have two natures? What I am now about to observe, I desire may be understood in the sense in which I have conceived, and in which I declare it. It appears that a species of torture has been invented in our days, till then unknown; a novel kind of restraint upon the mind, namely, that of contradictions, which consist in desiring the cause, and rejecting the effect, in exciting and restraining at the same moment. This is to be almost every

where met with. The Governments are very well inclined towards the benefits of civilisation, which add to their power; but they are very inimical to the moral effects, which are directed towards the appreciation and communication of their power. They wish that men should be more learned, but that they should not be inclined to make use of their acquisition otherwise than for their private advantage. In a word, they are drawn into a whirlpool of contradictions, from which they know not how to extricate themselves. All this is truly incomprehensible, and, I may add, it reflects but little honour upon our times. Germany, as well as the rest of Europe, experiences the effects of this great contradiction. This country is rapidly improving in civilisation, and is equal, in many respects, to the best parts of Europe, and to some superior. The German is studious, meditative, and a lover of theories. His mind proceeds logically, and is fond of supporting itself upon principles. He is obstinate. He is a vase, which strongly retains the odour of the fluid by which it has once been impregnated. His country was always the land of sects and of systems. The condition of a professor was never invested with more honours or authority in any country than in this. It now contains

an infinite number of Universities and of schools, both public and private, which are visited by every nation, and particularly by those of the North. Civilisation is, therefore, strongly excited by the moral state of Germany, and the greater part of its Governments are endeavouring to arrest its progress, which, on the other hand, they encourage with all their power. How can these things be reconciled? In what manner do these Governments resolve so great a problem as this? *How can those who are averse to a thing, be brought to support it continually? and how can those who desire a thing, be made to reject it?* for the whole of the question turns definitively upon this point: it is reduced to the result of the opposition of the heart to the arms; the one being obliged to serve that, which the other rejects, and the *absolute* desiring the *constitutional man* to support him. I should be glad to receive some assistance on this point; for it is in vain that I endeavour to discover how it would be possible to govern, according to the absolute system, that, which in future, will be formed only of constitutional parts; and it is quite impossible that all should not be brought to this conclusion. To be convinced of this, we have only to contemplate the rising generation, the object of so much alarm, of so

many accusations. Do we not every where find them studious, serious, averse to dissipation, and intent upon questions of social order. Youth is the instrument by which all human changes are effected; time is its portion; the world is its infallible *appanage*. Youth, which replacing the generations that descend into the tomb, and occupies in its turn all ranks of society, has formed the Christian world, and caused the reformation of Germany,—the great revolution has ended, by being the work *of the children*, often contested by the fathers. It must be acknowledged, that youth is entirely devoted to the new system of the world; when in 1813 it took up arms in Prussia, it was instigated by this new spirit created by civilisation, and in offering to fly to the assistance of the Greeks, it is carried towards the shore of the Bosphorus by the same spirit that impelled them on to those of the reconquered Rhine, and to the astonished Seine. Governments oppose themselves to the Crusades, which it burns to undertake in favour of the Greeks, but its inclination is nevertheless certain.

The progress of civilisation, by strengthening and enlarging the mind, will therefore preserve the Constitutional System from all fear of retrograding, and, in spite of every opposition, will

serve it both as a rampart and a means of communication.

If any inclination towards retrogradation can be sensibly perceived any where, it is in France only, where a class, which is devoted both by system and feeling, to retrogradation, has been recalled to power by the new law of election: but its return to the political horizon has been but as a cloud, it has been expelled by its extravagant propositions. The men, belonging to this party, possess at least one excellent quality, that of carrying with them a remedy for the evil they may create,—it is quite sufficient that they commence operations, every one immediately recoils with horror. It is true there has been loss of time, but no real retrogradation has been effected; which is very different. The time may be regained.

In Chap. VIII. page 112, of *Europe and America in* 1820, I have demonstrated, that the movement of the reform which proceeds from civilisation, and leads to the establishment of the constitutional system, cannot be arrested. I have thus proved that this system cannot retrograde, for the perpetuity of the cause is the guarantee of that of the effect.

CHAP. XI.

THAT ALL THE PRESENT QUESTIONS RELATE TO THE SOCIAL CONTRACT. SOVEREIGNTY OF THE PEOPLE; SIGNIFICATION OF THIS WORD.

WHENEVER a question arises, nothing is more essential than to determine its nature and its meaning; *Define!* was Voltaire's constant exclamation. Disputes would cease, or rather would never occur, if that were the invariable commencement. Every question ought to carry its definition with it, engraven, as it were, on a frontispiece; the subject of discourse would then always be distinctly understood. By adopting the opposite method, one might dispute to eternity, without advancing a single step. What of perspicuity is the triumph of ignorance and insincerity. I regret being obliged to declare, that almost all discussions in our days present little else, than a rambling incoherency, that is to say, a want of precise and well-defined notions, which are the basis of a universal language, a universality without which it is useless

to discuss, for it would be impossible to be understood.

It is from a desire of being well understood, and of being able to proceed without interruption, that I am led to observe, that almost all the questions in the present day relate to the social contract, that is to say, to the very nature of societies. I have already made this remark in my two works on the Congress of Carlsbad, and in *L'Europe et l'Amerique en* 1820. Every thing which has taken place since that period has convinced me of the necessity of repeating this observation, and of giving it all possible publicity, for I have had occasion to remark from the events themselves, which have followed those publications, that men were not aware of the nature of the things which they did, nor of the position in which they themselves were placed in the world. I request the attention of the reader throughout the examination I am about to pursue.

It will not be denied, that every question, relative to the formation of a social establishment, and by that means connected with the constitutive order of a State, forms a part of the social contract, for it is itself, which is then treated of.

And it must be granted, that every action, having for its object the modification or destruction of the establishment of a State, must also relate to the social contract; for there also it is the subject in question. Consequently, if all things in Europe and America tend to the formation, destruction, or impediment of constitutive establishments, the attention of these countries must be turned towards the *Social Contract*. We have therefore only to take a cursory view of it, and to observe the occurrences which take place there;—facts will be the true judges of the question.

In America, the Floridas have changed their government; they have passed from that of an European monarchy, into an incorporation with an American republic. Here the social contract is clearly visible, for there is a change in the association of the parties, and a transfer to another mode of existence;—it includes a new contract between new associates, and this contract has a new object.

Mexico proclaims her independence, demands a new chief, and gives herself a new constitution. Nothing can be more formal, or bear a greater resemblance to the social contract.

The republic of Colombia completes its separation from its ancient master, and, by giving itself a new organization, passes into a mode of existence entirely different from that of the old regime. Here we again find another government, other contracting parties, other conditions of association, and consequently another social contract.

Peru, Buenos Ayres, Chili, are all engaged in a similar movement, although the former partakes of it in an unequal degree. With the other two, all is consummated; there again is a social contract between new contracting parties, and upon perfectly new conditions.

The Brazils, by firmly adhering, as they have done, to the constitutional system proclaimed in Portugal, have renewed the social contract with her, for this is the only tie which attaches them to her, and even this connexion will depend on a great concurrence of circumstances.

In St. Domingo, the conversion of a monarchy into a republic has been effected; the state has therefore been renewed, and its social contract altered. Thus much for America: let us now proceed to Europe.

Portugal and Spain have completely renewed their social contract; the difficulties which are experienced in some parts of Spain arise from the refusal of some of the members of the ancient association, to enter into the new one.

Naples had re-constructed her social contract; Sicily desired a separate one for herself; Piedmont had sketched out hers: we may believe that the whole of Italy is re-constructing it *in petto*, and that, were it not for the Hungarian bayonets, it would not be slow in developing itself.

In France, some of the questions which are agitated, relate to the constitutional system, that is to say, to the social contract. Its principles have been recognised, it is true, but the organisation, from which it must derive its action, is yet incomplete; every one endeavours to render it favourable to his own interests, and to attract it towards himself.

In England, the radicals are nothing else than members of the present association, who, (whether with or without reason, is not the present question,) think themselves injured by its defects, and demand redress in their own way,

or, in other words, they require a new social contract.

The emancipation of the Irish catholics is of itself only the contract of one part of the English association, which requires the other should be placed on the same level with itself, by a participation of rights, of which it has deprived it. During one hundred years this emancipation has been converted into a religious or a political question, while in fact it belongs only to the social contract.

Norway is called upon again to see her social contract. The Congresses of Vienna, of Carlsbad, the Diet of Frankfort, have made social contracts, by decreeing, promising, and refusing Constitutions of State, for these States changed the relative positions of the princes with subjects, and those of the subjects amongst themselves.

The Congresses of Troppau and Laybach have gone still further, they have acted upon one society after another, and, by their interference, have decided one of the most important points of social order, that of the right of one nation to interfere in the internal affairs of another. By opposing themselves, as they

have done, to the social renovation, which is effecting in different places;—by advancing a doctrine on monarchical principles, (without examining here, the intrinsic merit of that doctrine,) they have entered deeply into the questions of the social contract, because they have thereby decided upon social powers. They have established or caused to be established at Naples, nominal estates;—they have decreed, that *one only* should be possessed of all power, should dispose of the condition of the others, and might annul a contract, to which he had just assented. By these means, they have given a new form to the Neapolitan association, and have decided upon her social contract. When the King of Sardinia declared, that, holding his power from God alone, and being determined not to admit any person to a participation of it, he was authorized to govern the subjects, which Providence had confided to him, according to his own laws, he made an act of the social contract for the supreme chief, because he thereby declared, that all the powers of the association belonged to him exclusively; that all were subjects, and he alone master; that all ought to obey and he alone command; that no contract existed between him and his subjects, but that there existed in his favour an exclusive dominion, the origin of which was in heaven.

There is great convenience, as well as security, in placing our archives so high. It is certainly impossible to penetrate deeper into the social contract.

Again, it is to be found in the affairs of Greece; what is it she requires? To deliver herself from Turkish dominion, and to reunite into one single association, the scattered members of that people, which are bound together by the ties of blood, of religion, of language, of historical affiliation, and of manners. Either this belongs to the social contract, or there never existed any. Greece endeavours to escape from a state of subjection to that of association, and this act relates to the social contract. It follows from this analysis, that the universe is at present set in motion, by one uniform spring—the social contract;—that it is this, which under a thousand forms, acts and presents itself every where—which constitutes that state of social reform, which is begun in one place, perfected in another, and desired every where,—which, for many years, we have not ceased to represent, as the principle of every thing that is done in the present world, which interested men are constantly endeavouring to transform into an ancient world, a stationary world, a world of former days,

charges against which the real world, the true world, the present world, is constantly protesting.

Further, this analysis presents Europe divided into two zones, one of the social contract, the other of absolute power; the one, of liberty, more or less duly regulated by the acknowledged rights of the subjects—the other, in which they have no acknowledged rights whatever. This distinction is constantly shewing itself, and is the cause of the opposition of one part of Europe to the other. The zone of absolute power cannot sympathise with that of rights; their principles of existence are in diametrical opposition, the one excludes the other;—they are the Pagans and Christians confronted. The zone of absolute power, dreads to come in contact with that of rights, it is alarmed at the ideas it offers, or suggests, and at the comparisons it draws: it is informed by an inward consciousness, that the one cannot exsist near the other; the Congresses of Troppau and Laybach have done this, and at the same time that we give them credit for the purest intentions, it is impossible, for the most superficial observer, not to recognize in them, this warfare of the zone of absolute power against that of rights; the war of Austria

against Naples has no other meaning. She says to Naples, *My government is one of absolute power, you have just established one of rights. You are my near neighbour, your proximity might become troublesome to me, by placing before the eyes of my subjects, an example, which is capable of inducing them to think, and to draw comparisons; this does not suit me, I shall, therefore, restore you to your ancient government of absolute power; you will then be quiet, and so shall I.* This constitutes the whole war of Naples;—it is evidently purely that of the social contract.

Let us now turn to the *sovereignty of the people*, and see, whether this *accursed name*, this dogma, which has been qualified as *atheistical*, deserves all the imprecations, which have been lavished upon it, and whether it is so constituted as to excite all the terrors, whether real or fictitious, which we daily witness; for in all this, a great share belongs to interested fictions.

With regard to the epithet—*atheistical dogma*, I am indebted to the person, who revealed this till now unknown attribute of this sovereignty, for considerable fatigue of mind, for I have never been able to succeed in discovering the real meaning of these words. Whe-

ther the people be, or be not the *sovereign* of the associations which it forms; what has either to do with the existence of the Deity? What relation does there exist between these two things? Men, who busy themselves with the dissemination of doctrines, ought to know well, how to make those distinctions, which the nature of things requires; the affairs of heaven must be regulated solely by a divine system, and those of the earth, by a human one! that is to say, by social order, since man is a social being. Every thing ought to be put in its proper place. What is understood by *people*, by *sovereignty?*

Does the idea of the *people* present only those classes, who are deficient in intelligence from want of education and fortune; who have not time to instruct themselves, who are devoted to professions which occupy the hands to the exclusion of the mind, who have as just a claim to the protection of society as its other members; but who have not the same right to govern it, because their deficiency of intelligence would only produce confusion and discord? For the management of society consists entirely in regularity, which requires intelligence, and not in irregularity, which could not fail to ensue

from the introduction of those classes into a share of the Government. If this be the meaning of the word *people*, it is perfectly correct, not to feel any predilection for such a Sovereignty; for my own part, I do not, and I will never be seen placing the throne in the streets: *I know too well who would seat themselves upon it.* But if you understand by it, the assemblage of all the members of the associations, of their powers and their agency, exercised for its best advantage, according to those laws and by those instruments, which it thinks fittest to procure this general utility, then the case is altered; here I perceive an idea, as just and as social, as the first is void of reason and menacing to the great body of society. In the first case, only blind and destructive people are to be seen, in the second we perceive guides and preservers: this, we see, is very different. The error arises from the habit, which has been contracted, of attaching to the word *people*, the idea of a mob and of every thing that is calculated to throw society into disorder; instead of which, in the acceptation of the term, as received among all reasonable men, the sovereignty of the people, is only that of society over itself; besides, how could any man, unless he were deprived of all sense, or had abjured the

dignity of his own being, tax with error, danger, and above all with atheism, a question so simple as that, which goes no further than to maintain, that societies have the right to make those laws by which they are to be ruled? If the right is not to be discovered in them, where is it to be found? It must be beyond the limits of society, for there is no medium; it must be either within, or without them. Society is the inhabited house, and it seems very natural, that the proprietors, who defray all the expenses, should possess the right of regulating the arrangements of it;—the distribution of the social powers corresponds exactly with this position, and it is not more reasonable to contest the latter power than the former.

All the clamour and scandal that has been occasioned by the word *Sovereignty of the People*, would have vanished, if that of *Sovereignty of Society* had been substituted in its stead; then would have disappeared all those phantoms, all those spectres, which are raised every time that that *detested and accursed word, Sovereignty of the People*, is made use of. In order to avoid and prevent these dissensions, a mutual understanding is alone necessary; for

my own part, as I wish to be understood and to avoid all quarrels, I declare that I have never understood, and never shall understand by the term *Sovereignty of the People*, any thing else than the *Sovereignty of Societies over themselves*, and I request that my words may not be otherwise interpreted.

CHAP. XII.

NECESSITY OF DETERMINING THE QUESTION OF THE SOCIAL CONTRACT.

Both Montesqieu and Rousseau have treated upon this subject, and still we are obliged to agitate and discuss it! Which should this most excite, our astonishment or our regrets? Is there, then, any thing wanting in the theory of these works, or in that demonstration, which overpowers and subdues the mind?

After the declaration of rights and liberties of the people of England, which commenced in 1628, and was definitively completed and recognized in 1688; after those of the United States in 1782, and of the Constituent Assembly in 1789; after all that has been said, done and recognized, throughout a great part of Europe in the interval between 1789 and 1814; after the recognition of the French Charter, a considerable part of which, by regulating the exercise of public power, and fixing the rights of citizens, evidently belongs to the social

contract; after the declarations, formally issued by the great Republics, which are forming themselves in America from the wreck of the Spanish Empire; after the doctrines, professed by the Cortes of Spain and Portugal, by the Parliament of Naples, and propagated by Spain and Portugal in America and in the Brazils; after a manifestation and a diffusion of principles, which the whole of America has followed, and the one half of Europe has embraced; how, I say, is it possible to be undecided upon a thing, which has in its favour the evidence of theory, supported by so many facts? There is nothing wanting on the side of practice, nothing on that of theory; and yet Europe is divided into two zones of conduct, upon a thing which, by principle, admits of no division, for there are not two human kinds, or two human species; the beings who have received from Heaven the same faculties, the same tastes, the same essential conformation, both moral and physical, cannot otherwise than possess the same natural rights, and that, in virtue of a common creation. Who then can confer the right of assisting in the management of their own affairs on the one half, and exclude the other? In what part of human organization does that principle of the difference of right exist, which appears between the one and the

other? The first can see, and talk, and act for themselves—this is their acknowledged right; that of the second is restricted to follow, with downcast or rather with closed eyes, which is still more convenient for the leaders, and with gagged mouths, which place their Governors perfectly at their ease. Is human nature different in republics and in elective kingdoms, which have their *pacta conventa* different from that of countries under a pure despotism? Where is the commencement, where is the end of this difference? This is *a point in the natural history of human kind,* which the *political Buffons* have not yet decided. The method of exercising the rights of human nature has varied, and may still vary according to the intelligence of the contracting parties, as well as to a thousand other circumstances; but it is evident, that in proportion as intelligence becomes equalized, and the effect of the primary circumstances diminishes, a general level, the work of civilisation will be formed, which will lead mankind, now assimilated by the effects of the same civilisation, to the same form of Government. Then will appear a perfect uniformity in the principles of society, in religion, morals and physics. Civilisation will inevitably bring this uniformity on the wings of time. The only remains of past discord, then to be found

amongst mankind, become enlightened, will be astonishment at the possibility of its ever having existed.

It appears that the inclination which men in general have for acknowledged physical truths, is changed into aversion for those of morals; they feel no repugnance to adopt the former, but the latter fills them with apprehension and alarm. Three hundred years back, astronomy underwent a complete change; a learned, and better directed observation, by fixing the real state of the heavens, made the planets pass from motion to rest and from rest to motion—the world applauded and adopted; a nicer investigation into the component parts of bodies, restored fluidity to those purple streams which circulate in all animated bodies; and the world again patronised the law of this new discovery; the *Social Contract* appears, and the world resounds with clamorous outcries, which have not yet ceased. Whence arises this difference between the reception of the first doctrines or discoveries, (for we are reduced to consider the *Social Contract* as a discovery, so profound was the degradation into which the human species had been plunged by ignorance,) and that which the second has experienced? The explanation is comprised in one word, *Interest*. There can

be no compromise with the arts or sciences, but the case is very different with principles, and particularly those which apply to *social rights:* these in all times have been the *stumbling-block.* It is interest, therefore, which opposes the uniform adoption of those principles, by which the one half of Europe is already governed. The whole of this question then is, that of the interests of the few against the interests of *all.* But as the few, who are in possession of the powers of society, make them subservient to the support of their tyranny, it is essential,

1st. Well to define the nature of the question.

2dly. To come to some definite conclusion, in order that an end may at length be put to that discord which divides human society in general, and European society in particular.

In this place I neither seek, nor do I pretend to fix the nature of the decision; I do not aspire to make the balance preponderate either on one side or the other; I only ask for *a solution,* in order that uniformity and tranquillity may be attained, for the absence of the first will inevitably cause that of the second. In this case, Europe will continue to offer a similar scene to

that of the Chamber of Deputies, in which a direct and permanent contradiction leads to the most acrimonious collision, and causes the most envenomed shafts to be hurled on both sides.

Peace, reigned in Germany under the uniformity of Catholicism;—it also reigned throughout the universe under the uniformity of paganism, when doctrines, different to those which were diffused throughout the empire, began to discover themselves. These introduced contradictions, which were immediately followed by the most active discord; the ancient possession defended itself to the utmost, and only submitted at the last extremity; the same occurs here: the world, asleep or heedless, drawn into a different course, it matters not which, has, apparently, suffered itself to be led, during many centuries; it has submitted to all yokes, to all curbs, to all masters; and, like the ox and the horse, its head, its mouth, its back, have submitted to all that was required. A thousand different springs having introduced intelligence, have caused people to inquire, to reflect, to consider, to revert to the sorrowful and inglorious times past, they have felt and found themselves similarly composed to those who enjoy the benefit of the difference they have introduced between themselves and their fellow-

creatures;—they have ended, by reascending gradually to the principles of societies, and by comparing them with their actual situation;—many have made their *petition of rights*, some earlier and some later, but each in his turn, and have demanded also their *pacta conventa*. One half of human societies has entered into the system of rights, the other has remained under the ancient system of domination, to which it adheres strongly, and uses those means with which it is supplied by that system, in order to defend itself against the attacks of the former, which causes it great apprehension.

It is too evident, that such a contest can no more continue with peace, than paganism and catholicism could maintain it in opposition to Christianity and the dawning reformation. In fact, how can the world, being half pagan and half Christian, be conceived to be in peace, possessing, as we do, the present state of civilisation, that is to say, with the continual action of one party on the other; for it must not be dissembled, that, if peace reigns between Christianity and Mahometanism, between which the world is nearly divided, it is because there is nothing in common between the parties, devoted as each is to one of these species of worship: civilisation has raised insurmountable

barriers between them. It is not the same with the dissenting parties of Europe; they are bound by a thousand ties which do not permit their ceasing, for a single moment, to act upon each other. Ancient Europe lived under a nearly uniform law, which maintained peace between all parties;—a uniform despotism rules over Asia and Africa;—let the *social contract* and the *spirit of the laws* penetrate into these countries; introduce the intelligence of Europe with all the apparatus of her civilisation, and you will then see, whether the most deadly quarrels will not be raised between the partisans of the ancient and of the new system; between those who preserve the one, and those who adopt the other; there will be no peace but by the triumph of one of them, that is to say, by the re-establishment of uniformity; and in all this no one can be accused, for it is not the fault of men, it is the effect of the nature of things, which does not admit of any compromise between two great neighbouring interests, which reciprocally exclude each other;—such is the effect of the settled opinion of ideas, when one half of society adopts those which are diametrically opposite to those of the other party;—they must combat each other, and their disputes be rendered eternal.

I have already had occasion to notice the embarrassment which the formal and solemn contradiction that has arisen at Troppau and at Laybach, between the three northern courts and England, upon a very principal point of the social system,—the right of interfering in the internal affairs of nations, has introduced into the practical conduct of Europeans. What decision can an honest man, who endeavours to find a certain rule for his conduct, adopt, in the midst of this divergency, in this incompatibility of opinions, emanating from authorities of equal weight? Which shall he coincide with? The effect of this contradiction is, that what in one country would be considered as legitimate and honorable, would be prohibited and exposed to persecution in another;—a person who would support, in London, the right of intervention on the part of powers, would be laughed at and would find himself exposed to the animadversion of the government; and another, who embraced the contrary opinion in Austria, Prussia, or Russia, would incur the displeasure of the governments of those countries, and perhaps be subjected to some act of severity. For the maintenance of peace, the social doctrines ought to possess that tranquil enjoyment of uniformity,

which morality, whose principles are equally recognised in all places, every where obtains.

It is therefore evident that an urgent necessity exists, of deciding the primitive questions of human nature in an uniform manner;—at the head of these, the following, which is the basis of all social order, naturally finds its place. *Do human societies consist of associations, regulated by laws emanating from themselves, and executed by their own agents, with a view to the general utility of the association, or are they simply dominations, of which one or a few has the sole direction?* First, decide this—enforce the universal adoption of this decision, or else submit to an eternal confusion.

The church has given, upon this article, as well as on many others, a great example of wisdom, accompanied by great instruction to civil societies. She has fixed the principle of authority with an invariable and peremptory precision; she has closed the door to all contestations, divergences, and incoherences; she has traced an inflexible line, on each side of which she has opposed error and truth; she has thus furnished her followers with an infallible guide, by which they may always know what they have to expect, and under whose direction they

cannot go astray. This is the true method of conducting men, and of keeping them in peace. By these traits we recognise a profound knowledge of social man, with the certain safeguards of tranquillity. But when, amongst these preceptors of mankind, nothing is to be perceived but contradictions, upon what, in the language of social order, are called articles of faith, what but disorder, confusion, and discord, can be expected among those societies which cannot even agree amongst themselves upon the first principles of their existence: and yet this is precisely the situation in which Europe, and we with it, stand at present.

CHAP. XIII.

RECAPITULATION.

At length, after a long journey, I have arrived at the end of these preliminary observations; it is thus the traveller reaches the summit of a mountain by long circuitous paths;—I have not, more than him, sought those I have been obliged to pass through. The necessity thereof has shewn itself in the multitude of erroneous notions in which all the questions incidental to this work are involved, by the obstinacy in maintaining and returning to them, by the doubts which have been raised upon the most evident things, and with which too many heads have been successfully filled. I must, without any hostile feeling, say, that we have to do with a very singular species of adversary; they live upon enigmas, suppositions, allegations, accusations; nothing shakes the obstinacy of their opinions, they seek shelter in the shade, they fly from every thing that is clear and evident, from every place in which we could come to close quarters with them, they are devoted to

amphibology, are traducers of their own times; and panegyrists, if not adorers, of those times, the date of which they are unable to fix. What can be done in such a case, if it be not to oppose just definitions, clear and well-defined premises, and perspicuous language, to hackneyed accusations and words without meaning. Without such a method, without keeping the attention alive, and letting nothing pass, without fixing and agreeing upon the acceptation of its signification, we may dispute without end, and without hope of meeting on parallel roads, whilst we pursue opposite directions.

Such is the painful labour to which we are condemned, by an extravagant opposition to every thing real in existence; by a verbiage, arising from a vacuity of ideas; by a phantom, which is only destroyed, in order to reappear, and which again falls upon you, like the stone of Sisyphus. In a similar system of discussion, prolixity and repetition become inevitable, we are obliged to fight from post to post, and follow the enemy foot by foot, so as to present ourselves, in proper order, before the body of the place. Such has been the constrained order of this work. Its only aim is instruction, which cannot be drawn from indistinctness. It is only to be met with in the clearness and

coherency of the principles, notions, ideas, and facts, which are exhibited. I have endeavoured to arrive at this point, from which all the parts of the subject I have to treat upon, may be discerned in a certain and complete manner. If the principles be true, all dispute upon the consequences will be impossible, and we shall easily arrive at the end of a road, from which all obstacles have been removed.

It is for the perfect elucidation of the subject, that I have thought proper to recapitulate in this place, the principal features of the questions I have thus far treated upon. The bringing them into one focus, will facilitate the comprehension of what is to follow. We have discovered the nature of the statistics of the political Powers that occupy the greatest portion of the East of Europe, and that Russia possessed the largest portion of it. This first part has been followed by a picture of moral statistics, of the dispositions of its inhabitants, which exhibit them as belonging to the constitutional system, and of the exposition of the demireligious, or purely political alliances, which reunite the principal Powers of Europe, with a consideration of the probable employment of those forces, and of the duration of

those alliances. The analysis of these events, and of the general progress of affairs, in 1821, has shewn, that the spirit of this year, like that of 1820, has been perfectly pacific and constitutional. This consideration has led us to examine the operation of civilisation and the degrees of its power, as a general and unavoidable agent in the whole fabrication of modern societies. The necessity of enforcing the proper understanding of the state of Europe, has obliged me to shew, 1st, where the principal powers are seated, the manner in which they have acted hitherto, by which we are enabled to judge how they will proceed for the future: 2dly, the division of Europe into two zones of power, in opposition to each other; to fix their respective limits; and to conclude, that the present state can only be provisional: 3dly, to prove, by the picture of the general movement in Europe and America, that the constitutional system has not retrograded during the course of 1821: 4thly, to demonstrate, that the social contract is the main spring of all the questions which are agitated in Europe and America, and that there is nothing of greater importance to the tranquillity of that country than its uniformly adopted solution. This recapitulation, by recalling the preceding questions to the recol-

lection of the reader, will enable him the better to understand what we shall now enter upon.

CHAP. XIV.

ITALY;—CONGRESSES OF TROPPAU AND LAYBACH.—NAPLES.

I now arrive at questions which, although delicate, are perfectly clear in themselves. Acts will here present themselves, the authors of which are arrived at the summit of human grandeur, and direct the principal Powers of Europe. Great respect is due to them personally, and this legitimate tribute is in perfect accord with my own sentiments towards them and their rank. My expressions will, therefore, be guarded. I owe it to myself; for the want of that respect which is required by important considerations, in the civilized world, is never unaccompanied by shame, and loss of esteem, to him who refuses to pay it; I owe it to the noble cause which I support, that the error of its defender may not deprive it of any part of its force; for it cannot be doubted, that, in these days of *personality*, the fault of the writer would immediately lead to the inculpation of

the thing itself; but this circumspection ought neither to weaken the claims of truth, nor tend to the prejudice of *rights*. This is the object of our search. It is equally the safeguard of all. So, in forwarding its interests, and endeavouring to disperse those clouds, by which it is obscured in so many places, we are essentially promoting universal welfare.

It is not to-day only that I have learnt, in treating of political matters, to discriminate between the opinions and acts and the persons; to examine the one, and to honour the other. No one, who possesses good breeding, can find any difficulty in reconciling this. No personal motive having ever entered into the discussions I have gone into, I have always taken care to strike only the unskilful, and the malicious. I have censured only false views, and false measures. It is true, censure like this may sometimes afflict more than an insult; the public exposition of errors and of faults may humiliate more than the reproof of vice itself; but, by restricting ourselves to the demonstration of error, when it is fully proved, what have those to complain of, who feel the unpleasantness of its publication?

When, during the Revolution, I showed the

falseness of the direction which was then followed, people were not backward in raising clamours against the temerity of my conclusions; and a short time afterwards, the man of prejudice, the evangelist of aristocracy, *Burke*, said, *that the coalition had not committed any errors, but that its whole composition was that of error.* When urged on by the desire of averting the catastrophes which have overspread the soil of America, I traced out a sketch of the conduct, which so new, so grave, and so urgent a system of things required; when I told the diplomatists assembled at Carlsbad, that if they failed in appreciating the true state of Europe, they might expect to hold many more Congresses; when, ever since 1815, I pointed out the approach of the clouds that would be raised over Spain, by the direction that had unfortunately been chosen; when, in 1819, inspired, as it were, by a prophetic spirit, at the sight of the growing dangers of that country, I pronounced these words: *Spain advances towards an impending catastrophe, and it is too evident that a cruel destiny is about to make the King regret Valencey;* and when, at the hazard of my liberty, which also involved that of my life, I shewed, upon the passing of the election law, the consequences of that law; on all

these occasions, things and their necessary results were alone touched upon. The persons and motives were respected. God is the judge of these, and I cannot usurp his place. All intentions ought to be believed good; and, until evidence of the contrary, presumption is in their favour. That which was my constant rule in preceding circumstances will be so more strongly in this, for my duties reach still higher. In speaking of the Congresses, it has been impossible for me to avoid animadverting on those who have formed them, of Princes and Ministers, names which I do not affect in writing, but to which I pay respect, whenever the opportunity presents itself. I feel pleasure in repeating, here, my former observations on their persons and intentions.* I believe them to be full of integrity, and ever observant of

* The Ministers, generally speaking, are men far advanced in civilisation, moderate in their character, their principles, and their habits, friends to the arts and sciences, and lovers of rectitude and humanity. If a loftiness of views cannot be considered as belonging to them, neither does that exaltation of sentiment, which power is so subject to bring forth, suffer itself to be felt by them; and it is but right to say, that these Ministers, in general, are personally of greater worth than the method of Government they practice; and that, with them, men temper things, and deprive them of a part of their asperity. If great Statesmen have disappeared, so have unprincipled Ministers. If there is less to admire, there is also less to fear.

(Carlsbad, 1 vol. preface, p. 4.)

their public sentiments, I profess full and entire confidence in the often repeated declaration of their disinterestedness; it is, therefore, always with sorrow that I meet with contrary proofs, which should be referred to the false and interested diplomacy of the old regime, which too long retained its influence in the Cabinets. These practices belong to other times and other men. These men are exempt from them, and there would be little justice in making them suffer for the errors of their predecessors. Error may certainly be

The pleasure I feel in rendering this homage to the German Princes, is the more sincere, because it cannot, in any way, be considered as being in view of present or future interest. These Princes are of greater personal worth than their mode of Government. It is from them it receives all it possesses of durability, and their qualities serve as its corrective. They are, for the greater part, characterized by kindness, humanity, love of instruction, absence of ostentation, dignity united to simplicity, a taste for, and often a cultivation of the arts and sciences. The princely families of Germany, like those of the North, frequently present the reunion of every thing that is most attractive, allied to every thing that is most august. To quote only one example, the King of Saxony has the appearance of a Sovereign, whom Fenelon would present to a people, whose happiness he was desirous of securing. If the people of the North generally possess an incontestable superiority over the people of the South of Europe, such as the Italians, Spaniards, and Portuguese; on their part, the Princes of Germany and of the North enjoy the same superiority relative to the Princes of these southern countries.

(Carlsbad, 2 vol. p. 160.)

the lot of the present leaders, but the old leaven of cupidity and treachery is certainly wanting. I regret, that in a cause, so elevated, so equitable as ours, any of those wrongs should enter, which may easily be turned into reproaches of want of candor or of discernment.

There are some questions which may be termed *bad*, because it is imposible to discuss them publicly without inconvenience. In certain cases, the chaste Themis refuses entrance to her temple, to all that do not form apart of her necessary train; in the same manner, the wisdom of parties interested, ought not to bring under public notice, those questions, the estimate of which can never be serviceable to whatever is placed under their care. Such are the questions upon religion, royalty, revolution, legitimacy, emigration, armies, the 20th March, property, and some others. And yet, what is done and what do we hear? And that in the face of the universe, and at every hour of the day.

During the last six years, I have lost no opportunity of insisting upon the necessity of flying from these dangerous rocks, but nothing has been listened to; on the contrary, it appears

that pains have been taken to reproduce these questions; at Troppau and at Laybach, doctrines have been proclaimed, which are in opposition to every thing that now forms the ideas and gives laws to the world; there reigns in France, a mania of recurring constantly to religion, legitimacy, the Revolution the 20th March 1815, and to I know not what else, at the same time, giving to these words, the most unaccountable acceptation; with these allegations, rights are formed and by that means, a necessity is created of examining both the one and the other; it is in consequence of this necessity, that we shall now proceed to this examination with that circumspection and calmness, which both the subject and our principles require.

Congresses of Troppau and Laybach.

These two Congresses are one and the same act—the motive of the first is that of the second, viz. the affairs of Italy. The only difference is in the situation of the scene. Troppau made way for Laybach; when an army was ready to march upon Naples, when one part of the plan was to draw the king to Laybach, the Congress was necessarily transferred from the interior of the Austrian monarchy, to a place more adjacent to the theatre of events.

The Congress was opened at Troppau on the 15th Nov. 1820, closed on the 30th Dec. transferred to Laybach on the 3rd Jan. 1821, and closed on the 13th May. These Congresses were formed by three Powers of the north, which had coalesced ever since 1813, and France, which had been admitted into the alliance since the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle.

The Emperors of Austria and Russia were present in person.

The Kings of France and Prussia, by their ministers.

England did not appear.

The open dissension of England, and the restrictions insisted upon by France on her accession to it, reduce the contracting parties of Troppau and Laybach to the three northern courts. The official documents mention them only, and bear only the signatures of their ministers.

England has formally disavowed the declaration of Troppau of the 8th Dec. 1820. Lord Castlereagh answered it in the circular, ad-

dressed to all the diplomatic agents of England, on the 19th Jan. 1821. Lord Liverpool disclaimed it in the House of Peers on the 3rd March, 1821, and upon this occasion characterized it in a manner which reflected but little honour upon it. France had acceded, but refused to take any part in the military measures against Naples. The reasons for this conduct I shall point out in due time.

England and France had limited their direct interference to the single case of insults offered to the King and to his family; a new principle in diplomacy, as may be seen by the letters of the French and English *chargés d' affaires* to the Neapolitan minister of the 10th, 11th, and 12th Feb. 1821.

The objects of the Congresses were: 1st, to destroy the constitutional system of Naples, and to maintain every thing as it was established in Italy: this evidently results from the circular put forth by the three courts, at the time of the dissolution of the Congress of Laybach on the 22nd May, 1821, as also from the proclamations of the old King of Sardinia, at the time of his abdication and of the new King, dated at Modena, the 16th, March, 1821. These documents.

prove, that the invariable principle of the policy of the sovereigns is to preserve every thing that is legally established.

2nd. Their second object was to induce the parliament of Naples, under the apprehension of powerful foreign intervention, to dissolve itself, and to restore to the King that power in the state which he possessed on the 2nd July, 1820.

3rd. The third object was to draw the King to Laybach, by making him play the part of mediator between the Congress and the Neapolitan people.

4th. In this state of things, France, not being able to accede to the hostile measures decreed against Naples, had changed its state of interference into one of mediation.

5th. Austria, as being most deeply interested, opened the campaign, and set the first army on foot.

6th. Russia formed the second line.

7th. Prussia did not arrive till afterwards, and had performed no military operations.

8th. It was correctly supposed that the military power of Austria alone, would be sufficient to bring about a speedy conclusion.

9th. The fate of Naples was decided; the question with respect to her, related neither to negociation nor discussion, but to submission; *to be, or not to be,* were the two alternatives between which she had to choose.

The King's letter to his son, and the report of the Duke de Gallo, conformable to the declarations of Laybach, leave no doubt upon this point.

This short account of the formation, the object and the acts of the Congresses, will be sufficient to give such an idea of these two assemblies, as it is necessary to possess, in order at the same time to know the facts, appreciate the motives, and distinguish the end. By this means we clearly see, what they have been, what they have done, and what they have wished to do.

Let us now examine the subject of their operations.

Subject of the Congresses.

Italiam! Italiam! My tears involuntarily flow when I contemplate the change of thy destinies; it presents, in one single act, the picture of the destiny of the world during the last twenty centuries; that which the Cimbri and the Teutoni began two thousand years ago, has now been completed by the hands of the descendants of the Scythians, the Pannonians and the Germans. They are now thy directors and thy masters, and if thou wert not always just in imposing thy yoke, what justice hast thou met with in return! what vengeance hast thou not suffered by groaning under the yoke of others in thy turn! at this very moment, the fate of this country has been fixed by the concurrence of three courts of the North. But before we enter into an examination of their competency, let us reconsider the object to which they have applied it, and some ideas may perhaps arise from this examination, which will enable us the better to appeciate the whole of this drama.

What is Italy? A country, divided into many parts and of which the scattered members form the appendage of several principalities, the most considerable of which are not purely Italian.

This magnificient country, which is supplied with a happy and powerful population, and which would be imposing by its mass, if it were, like so many other nations, united into one family, finds itself parcelled out at the will of policy, or by the interests of private families, so as to be stript of all those attributes which distinguish real political bodies. During fifteen hundred years, Italy has ceased to belong to herself; invaded and dismembered in turn by all those, who coveted her spoils and felt themselves strong enough to seize them, she has never known the pleasures of a family compact. The personal interests of her petty sovereigns, have always contributed to prevent this union; it was necessary that Italy should be reduced to a state of nullity, that they might acquire consideration. The policy of the popes has contributed more than any thing else, to the continuance of this partition, by which they preserve their elevation over those princes, who are of less consequence on account of their number, and who would be dangerous to their power, if an aggregation were to take place. When Alexander the VIth, Julius the IInd, and Leo the Xth, talked of driving the *French and German barbarians* out of Italy, it was not a feeling for the liberties of Italy, that suggested so noble an idea, had it been pure, but the

wish of becoming her masters, and of lording it over her principalities, already weakened by their divisions. This policy of the popes, has cost Italy her existence, *as a nation*, and the monuments of the arts, for which she may be indebted to them, can but ill compensate for its loss. Revolting as all the histories of Europe are, till the seventeenth century, still none surpasses, no, nor even equals in horror, that of Italy, whether from the ambition of her own subjects or from that of Foreigners. In short, this country, formerly the mistress of the universe, has been reduced, for the last two hundred years, by the continued action of these circumstances, to the state of a mere *museum*, a conservatory of music, a workshop of sculpture, or of painting, and as Montesquieu says, *a caravansera open to all who choose to lodge there, a caricature of sovereignties, the number of whose subjects is sometimes exceeded by that of the women in the seraglio of our glorious sultans. (Persian Letters.)* Where is the glory of Italy? What has she done to be deprived of it, and to sink beneath other nations? Whence has she acquired that bad name, with which she is so often stigmatized? Who has the right thus to deprive a nation of honor? To what does she owe this complete nullity, this total eclipse from the transactions of the world?

What place is she entitled to, in the order of power, of riches, of colonies? Whence do all these obliterations arise? Is her sun chilled? Is her soil become sterile, and her genius blunted? Are eighteen millions of Italians only of use to contribute to the pleasures of ten courts; are they mere decorators of chapels, and scene-shifters of theatres? are they only fit to swell the ranks of monks and Lazzaroni? Cannot their spirit raise itself beyond the baseness which always follows in the train of despotism or of puerile superstition? Whence does the cause of all these evils arise? From the Institutions. Whenever they are degrading, men must be debased. Confront twenty Englishmen with twenty Italians, the former bearing on their lofty brow that noble assurance of liberty, that pride, inspired by the sovereignty of the seas, by a munificent body of nobles, by a wide and powerful grasp which embraces both worlds, proud and enviable distinctions, all springing from the same source, the enjoyment of the rights of the man and the citizen; the latter, humiliated by fetters, poor from want of commerce, destitute of navies, of well frequented ports, of manufactories; and timid, as under the rod of power, or the discipline of convents;—by the simple attitude of these men, you may judge of the institutions under which

they have been formed. Does not the aspect of so many evils naturally induce the inquiry into the source of these evils, and whether Italy be not of greater intrinsic worth, than its exterior evinces? Can any doubt exist upon the subject? Italy nourishes a people who are at the same time the most ingenious and the most impassioned of the universe; are not these two stimuli sufficient to make men all that can be desired? What more did the Romans possess? Their genius, their ardent passions subdued the world. He who possesses these, is capable of every thing; history proves this, Italy is the mother of the arts, the seat of science; schools of all kinds are there to be found in abundance; the cultivation of intellect is encouraged in a thousand different ways; and it is desired that such an accumulation of means, that shoots, reared with so much care, should end by producing nothing! We are here again fallen into the snare of civilisation, the inevitable effects of which I have so often exhibited; we are here again involved in that contradiction, which I find the same in all places, by which men are formed after one manner, but are wanted to appear as if cast in a different mould; we think we see the agriculturist start back at the sight of an unexpected fruit, produced by the seed he had confided to the earth, and which he had cul-

tivated with the greatest care; we think we see men astonished at the fine edge of an instrument which they had applied to a stone, the most proper for sharpening it. This is the whole question, it is entirely that of civilisation. It is only requisite to know, whether this light shines over Italy as well as over the rest of the world; whether she entertains any communication with it; whether she knows and reads what passes there; whether she receives into her bosom the flower of Europe, the noble, the opulent, the learned. Amongst those thousands of men who come to render homage to her former greatness, and to what she still retains, to what she has been and to what she still might be, how many are there, who, like involuntary missionaries, acquaint her, by the simple comparison of their social condition with hers, with the melancholy state to which she has fallen, and, at the same time, instruct, reproach, and stimulate her. Are the days of Italian liberty so sunk in the darkness of ages, that no monuments nor vestiges of it are to be found in Italy? Supposing, on the contrary, they did exist, and that recently, and in considerable numbers, to what period does one part of their sovereignties and those who are invested with them, trace their origin? Is it many years since Italy, uniting nearly all her crowns under one, was on

the point of raising her head to a level with those, which are decorated with the diadem in the other parts of the world? Have the people preserved one particle of these hopes, so precious, but alas! so short-lived! What is the nature of the present government of Naples, and was it always absolute? Did the same hands which now hold the sceptre always wield it? Who has raised the present sovereign of Naples? Are there no tracks of blood to guide us to the tomb of him, who lately ruled there also? Have the thirty years of revolution that have changed the face of the world, passed over the heads of this people, like "a summer's cloud," without their special wonder? Some years back the King of Naples restored the Parliament to one of the two Sicilies, which renewed in it the image of her former power, and Great Britain guaranteed this restoration? Did she not, with noble consistency, protect both the prince from foreign attacks, and the people from oppression? Why should Naples be deprived of that, which was granted to Palermo?

Such was Italy, such was Naples, when the Revolution burst forth, and drew upon her the interference of foreigners.

I was under the necessity of placing this state

in a clear point of view, in order to deliver it from the narrow inclosure, in which it had been designedly placed, and to facilitate the opinion, whether the errors which Naples had committed, were such as to preclude every other species of correction than that of war, any other redresses of her wrongs than armed batallions. Considered in this light, the question becomes more important, and no longer presents only that criminal appearance of rebellion, violence, and subversion of order; blemishes, by which the events at Naples have been endeavoured to be tarnished: there may be other rights than those in favor of which the armament is pretended to have been formed, and, perhaps, if Naples had been in a formidable state, like England, or had been a continental power, defended by ramparts, and numerous and well-appointed batallions, as in other countries; if Naples had been in the situation of Spain, the same respect might have been paid to her that the latter has experienced.

Competency of the Congresses.

Of how many heads of European governments were the Congresses formed?

Of three.

Where were the heads of the other governments?

Absent.

Has their procuration been shewn?—No.

Was it necessary?

Yes; because the question related to the general interests of Europe, and to general principles, as the regulation of the conduct of nations. The regulation being made for all, ought to have been made by all.

Are the rights of sovereignty equal among all its members, and ought they to be graduated by the relative degrees of power?

No; all right as right, is absolute, equal among all sovereign associations, whatever may be their strength or their form;—there are not two species of sovereignty: right regards neither giant nor dwarf, but places every one on an equal level.

What was the principle of association between the three courts?

Opposition to Napoleon.

Had the league the power of extending the effects of this opposition to a dictatorial interference in the affairs of Europe?

No; its object being completed, it was properly and truly dissolved; the second object has nothing in common with the first; it interferes with rights about which there was no dispute, and which cannot be meddled with, without encroaching upon those of the legitimate proprietors.

What had the Congress of Vienna effected?

It had disposed of the spoils of Napoleon, and of the territories left vacant by him.

What was the principle of this distribution?

The right of conquest, the legitimate consequence of a legitimate war.

Could the Coalition survive its primary object, and then transfer itself to others?

No; the first, relating to the natural defence, was legitimate; the second, bearing upon the rights of others, ceases to be so, and carries with it seeds of serious inconveniences, which the first does not present.

Which are the three powers who have held the Congresses, and what is the mode of their government?

Three northern powers regulating the fate of Italy; themselves still keeping up an absolute military government. This should be observed.

Can one State interfere in the internal affairs of another?

Not under any pretence whatsoever; 1st, on account of the infraction of the sovereignty; 2d, on account of the consequences of an interference of that nature; for, when once admitted, where is the commencement, where is the end? upon what would it be exercised? upon what pretences would it not be required, and what opposition would it not give rise to?

What is the necessary effect of intervention in regard to states?

To make one the judge and sovereign of the other. See Poland.

Can the guarantee of one State, with regard to another, affect the constitution of this country, and the regulation of the powers among the constituted authorities?

No; because one state would then be the real *constituent*, and the guardian of the constitution of the other.

This species of intervention was very much in use in ancient diplomacy, and its results are very well known. Again, see Poland and Holland in 1787. But this practice has disappeared from modern affairs, in proportion as the true notions of social order have become better fixed, and been more widely spread;—no one would have dared to make such a proposition to England or the United States, on account of their progress in the science of social order; Russia would not have submitted to it, from her power; France would have considered it as an insult, had any one appeared as a mediator between the king and the parliaments, during their long and arduous struggles; Spain has proved that she would not permit any one to interfere in her affairs. Since the Revolution, which has spread the knowledge of public rights so far, this method has been completely abolished and discredited.

A guarantee can only take place between unequal powers, the strong guaranteeing the weak, and this constitutes the dependence of the latter and the absence of sovereignty. Between equals there is no object for a guaran-

tee, nor could it exist without many inconveniences.

What is the right of States, which are alarmed by the internal transactions of other States?

To fortify themselves by all the means in their power, by the means of remonstrance and of separation, and this is all. A contrary system would establish a state of warfare. A republican State might look with an evil eye on its neighbour forming itself into a monarchy, as in its turn a monarchy might conceive itself injured, by the conversion of a monarchical State into that of a republic, or even by the gradations of monarchical order, which it should have adopted, if they did not agree with its own The same in religion; the Catholic might be displeased at his neighbour embracing Protestantism, and the Protestant that his should change to Catholicism. Thus would the one half of the world be the judge of the domestic state, and conscience of the other. Good Heavens! what disorder, and introduced in the name of order itself! Can there be any other rule for its prevention, and for closing all access to it, than a strongly traced line of demarcation between all States, which will equally guarantee the rights of all? And where can this line

be found, if it be not in the absolute independence of each State, which secures the uniform right of transacting internally, whatever may be considered most consistent with its real interests. Beyond that, all is disorder, confusion, and warfare.

When has a State the right of interference?

When the internal transactions, or system, are made a means of hostility, either by direct attacks, or by public or secret practices. Then, these transactions, by emanating from the system, purely internal, become an external action, which may be repulsed by those means of opposition which are adopted among nations, for their defence against similar injuries; now, in this case, the injury cannot be mistaken, and as soon as it is ascertained then the interference no longer relates to the internal mode of Government, but to the exterior act; the satisfaction for which we have a right to pursue, by seeking its author wherever he may be found.

Had the Neapolitan Government acted in this hostile manner?

There are no traces of it to be found. So

far from it, that it has been seen to decline answering the appeal of the state of Beneventum. It might, if it had chosen, during the six months previous to the act of aggression, have changed the face of the Papal dominions, of Tuscany, and of Parma. It has abstained from all proceedings, assistance, connivance, and has confined itself to its internal affairs. This is a truth which no malevolence, no wish of criminating, can obscure. This will appear still more evident, by examining the nature of the plaintiffs, who have become accusers. What have Russia and Prussia in common with Naples? In what manner can she attack or injure them? These two States have nothing to do with her; and the appearance of the Sovereigns of Petersburgh and Berlin, interfering in the internal regulation of the affairs of Naples, may be considered as an entirely new phenomenon in history.

On ne s'attendoit guères
*A voir le nord dans cette affaire.**

The case is different with respect to Austria. Although separated from Naples by the Papal

* It was scarcely expected to find the North meddling in this affair.

dominions, she might, notwithstanding, entertain fears, on account of her Italian possessions, which could never be felt by her associates. But what right did she derive from this approximation, except in case of an open or a concealed, but certain attack? To watch, and to take precautions within herself, and to act resolutely against every thing, that could really have affected her. So far every thing is right, and according to order; beyond that commences the violation of rights.

Austria has been so well aware of this, that she has heaped up allegations against Naples, such as secret practices, insinuations, plots, and she has rummaged in the common arsenal of conspiracies. We shall soon see what she has found there. Her researches, however, are, in themselves, a confirmation of the principle I have laid down, that of the necessity of actual injury, to form the foundation for the legitimacy of interference. What was the declaration of the three Courts?

That it belonged to them to take such measures as were necessary to shield Europe from the calamities with which it was threatened by the revolutions of Spain, Naples, and

Portugal; that they have duties to fulfil towards the world.

Have these principles been adopted by Europe?

No; Sweden, the Low Countries, constitutional Germany, have been silent. The United States of America would have disavowed them, and yet public rights are well understood in that country. Spain has protested against them, France has acceded with restrictions, and England has peremptorily rejected them, accompanying her disapprobation even with reproach. There remain, therefore, in their favour, the authors of them, namely, the absolute monarchies, and those who are interested in the same principles, which are also the absolute monarchies of Italy.

Amidst the silence of some, and the contradictions of others, appears an act of the most serious importance, the opposition of the English Government. This is decisive of the cause, and I request attention to what follows; for the question relates, not to the aggrieving, or holding up to admiration, any one soever, but to the settling a point of public

right of the highest importance, which has been argued upon, by the principal Powers of Europe, in ways diametrically opposite. They are at variance upon the social contract, a circumstance perfectly novel and curious. The English Cabinet, struck with the inconveniences of the principles laid down by the Declaration of Troppau, of the 8th December, 1820, thought proper to address a Declaration to all its Ministers at the Courts of Europe, upon the mode of considering the principles contained in the Manifesto of Troppau. This document contains two articles.

1st. A disapproval of the revolution of Naples.

2d. A disapproval of the principles laid down by the Congress.

And who is the Minister opposing this Declaration?

The same who showed the greatest firmness in opposing Napoleon, who sought for enemies against him every where, who contributed the most to his fall, and who evinces a great aversion for liberalism; the predominating member of the Government of the country in

Europe, which is the most enlightened upon the doctrines of public rights, as well by her own experience, as from being long accustomed to discussions of this nature, and from her numerous theoretical and practical writers upon public laws; it is the Minister of a King, strongly opposed to the revolution, who declares the general principles of conduct of the Allies, contained in the Declaration of Troppau, as,

"1. Incompatible with the fundamental laws "of Great Britain.

"2. Likely to lead to a frequent and ex- "tensive interference, which cannot be ad- "mitted with safety, as a system of law "among nations.

"3. That the Allies cannot, according to "existing treaties, assume the general power "of interference, nor arrogate to themselves "such extraordinary powers, without intro- "ducing into Europe an oppressive system, "inefficacious in its object, and subject to "serious inconveniences.

"4. That the British Cabinet refuses to "accept the invitation of the three Courts.

" 5. That interference is just, whenever the " interests of a State are seriously compro- " mised by the domestic transactions of another " State; that the exercise of this right must " be justified and restricted by this necessity.

" 6. That this right cannot be applied gene- " rally, and without distinction, to all revo- " lutions.

" 7. That this right must be considered as " an exception of the highest importance, " which ought to be regulated according to " particular circumstances, and which is not " of such a nature as to be reduced to a rule, " nor to be incorporated in the institutions " of the laws of nations."

Such is this declaration, which may be termed classical.

Lord Liverpool, another Minister of the same King, on renewing, on his part, the disapproval in the House of Lords, which his colleague had pronounced in the House of Commons, says,

" No one can deplore more than myself, " the general principles laid down by the

" Allies. The publication of their declaration " is a most impolitic act, and ill-conceived " on their part."

I place all that the Opposition have said out of the question. I draw no consequences from the silence of Europe and America. I take no advantage of the protests of Spain, nor of the restrictions of France. I desire nothing that can lead to an altercation. I wish only to have to do with the three Courts, and England, their ally; this requires particular attention. I pay every deference to the intelligence of the three Cabinets, the authors of the declaration; but when obliged to make my option between them and the English author, I must request their permission to range myself on the side of the latter, as being their elder in questions of public right, which, for several ages, has been more *à la portée* of England, than of Russia, Prussia, or Austria, three absolute military Powers; who, from the nature of their Governments, may be more behindhand on these questions than the institutions of England have, for a long time, permitted her to be. I therefore cling (as, no doubt, every sensible man will,) to the decision of the British Cabinet; and resting upon it, I say, that

taking into consideration only the principles laid down by the Congresses, they are incompetent to interfere generally, under the plea of revolutionary movements, and are only entitled to a verdict, from the consideration of particular cases, such as is indicated by Lord Castlereagh.

If, as he says, Austria has felt certain injuries, she possessed the right of defending herself, and of punishing the authors of them, according to the forms, and by the means, authorised by the laws of nations.

I adopt, with the English Minister, the feeling of confidence in the intentions of the Sovereigns. I abandon myself, without hesitation, to their expressions of disinterestedness. Their personal virtues dispel all fear of abuse of the power they take upon themselves. But the question here relates to right, and not to persons, to the relations of people amongst themselves, to the regulations to be incorporated in the pandects of the laws of nations. This is a serious matter, and, in similar affairs, every thing should be of the last importance; all should be rigorously correct. In order not to deviate from this rectitude, I cannot avoid adhering to the sen-

tence pronounced by the English minister, who has declared these sentiments to be subversive of the private and public independence of other nations and leading to a supremacy, incompatible with their freedom and safety.

As, according to the axiom of right, there is no greater defect than that of want of power, *non est major defectus quam defectus potestatis;* and as the Congresses have acted out of the limits of their jurisdiction, and beyond the competency appertaining to them, so their whole labor is sapped from the foundation, with the exception of some right, resulting from the allegations brought forward by them, the nature and value of which we shall presently examine.

If they were deficient in competency with respect to Naples, what will become of that which they attribute to themselves, with respect to the whole world; by saying *that they have duties to fulfil towards it?* But what are these duties? Whom do they relate to? By what means will they be supported? Who is obliged to recognize and to submit to the consequences? On the one side, we see three powers of the North, and on the other the four quarters of the world. This dictatorship is immense.

Will it extend itself over Asia, Africa and America, if these latter please to interfere with their own governments? Every thing then is submitted to this tribunal, from which there is no appeal; nothing can escape its solicitude. This is certainly grand and novel, conferring freedom on some, and forging chains for others; the inconveniences, attached to the allegation of this vagueness and universality are felt; the style of diplomacy should be as precise as that of geometry, but on this occasion the Congresses have made use of that of oracles.

In this state of contradiction among authorities, which, from their nature, are equal in our eyes; authorities, of which the one, that contradicts the others, is neither their enemy nor in a state of revolution, but is on the contrary, their ally and the declared enemy of revolutions; until some compromise be made, every one is free to consider the principles of the Congress and the acts which have arisen out of them, in whatever light he may think best, and that without being wanting to any duty, or being guilty of indecorum. With respect to ourselves, the opinion of the English Government appears to us, by far the most preferable; it is our Ægis, and behind this ram-

part, we should say to whoever should think proper to attack us, *Per calcatos perge Britannos.*

I conclude this article by restating two things, which I have often mentioned in the course of this work.

1st. That in Europe, every thing is in a state of contradiction, upon the principles of social order amongst those who are the heads of it, and to whom the guidance of the rest belongs; what has passed between the Congresses and England, furnishes an incontestible proof of it.

2nd. That all the questions, which are now treated upon, inevitably lead to the social contract. It is certainly a question of this nature, which the Congresses have decided, by decreeing, as they have done, upon the right of interference in the domestic transactions of other States.

This is the ultimatum of Rousseau's *Social Contract*; the Congresses have been less delicate, they have cut short the question which arrested the progress of that powerful genius, who dived into the bosom of society, for the purpose of revealing to men their real

nature, their destinies, their rights and their duties.

The first point of discussion being permanently fixed, we shall proceed to others; we shall there again find one part of Europe in opposition to the other; here, that inevitable question of the social contract will again present itself, which whether we will or not, arises out of every discussion that is entered into, and, as may be said, from every ground that is broken. This examination appears to me the more important, as these acts have passed without giving rise to any observations; I am only aware of those of M. Bignon upon the Congress of Troppau, but of none upon that of Laybach. I have to remedy these serious omissions.

Declarations and Documents emanating from the Congresses.

These are: 1st. The declaration issued at Troppau, the 8th Dec. 1821.

2nd. The letters of the sovereigns, of the 22nd Dec. 1820, to the King of Naples, to induce him to proceed to Laybach.

3rd. The declaration of Austria, upon the events of Naples, 23rd Feb. 1821.

4th. The documents of Laybach respecting monarchical principles, 22nd Jan. 1821.

5th. The note from Russia to her minister at Naples, 31st Jan. 1821.

6th. The declaration of the three courts at the period of the close of the Congress of Laybach, 12th May, 1821.

7th. The circulars of the three courts addressed to their ministers at the courts of Europe, 12th May, 1821.

These documents present:

1st. A series of facts, which occurred during the Congresses.

2nd. The end proposed by them.

3rd. The motives which caused these meetings and their resolutions, as well as the allegations put forth to justify them.

4th. The declaration of the light in which the courts looked upon the rights of sovereignty.

5th. Several resolutions of these same courts.

By the declaration of Troppau, the three courts announce, that the events that have taken place in Spain, in Portugal, and in Naples, impose upon them the necessity of providing for the safety of Europe; they consider Napoleon as the representative of the Revolution; the Emperor of Austria's letter to the King of Naples, says, that the monarchs *have duties to fulfil towards the world.* The first document of Laybach, which does not bear the signatures of the ministers, but which belongs to the number of demi-official documents, by which the cabinets speak indirectly to the people, and, in a manner, sound their feelings, contains a long dissertation upon monarchical principles, the conclusion derived from which is, that sovereignty belongs essentially to the prince, and that constitutional acts are but modifications of government.

The circular of the 12th May, is:

1st. An act of accusation against the Revolution of Italy.

2nd. A solemn proclamation, that the power

is invested in the prince by divine right, that every amelioration in the government, can only proceed from his own free and perfectly spontaneous act.

3rd. It announces that another meeting will take place in 1822, for the purpose of considering the States of Naples.

4th. It makes known that the three courts consider the occurrences in Greece, as a consequence of the conspiracy which they oppose.

This short analysis was necessary to demonstrate, in a clear manner, what has occupied the thoughts of the Congresses, what has been desired, what has been said, what has been done there, and what is still proposed to be done.

The importance of some of the documents, induces us to annex them to the end of this chapter.

Examination of the Documents and Declarations of the Congresses.

I divide this examination into two parts:

1st. The charges of the Congresses.

2nd. Their doctrine of sovereignty.

Nothing so powerfully addresses my mind, nor so strongly interests my feelings, as the consideration of the government of human societies; it is the end, and as it were, the epitome of creation, and as the most noble instinct of man teaches him to look to the Divinity as the Author and Preserver of society; so in every thing belonging to the chiefs, many of whom style themselves the representatives of God upon the earth, we should be able to trace those attributes which command our homage towards that sacred source. When the inhabitants of the east wish to describe their great Monarch Aurengzeb, they say, that he has governed like the firmament, in silence; when therefore, necessity forces Princes to break this majestic silence, every word they utter, should be unquestionable, when they accuse; the proof should be clear, when they point out evils and

their remedies; no possibility should exist of calling in question either the existence of the one nor the efficacy of the other; above all things, no miscalculation should be apparent in the appreciation of the times, of the state of the public mind, nor of the gradual progress of the world, the principles of which are contained within its component elements. Nothing can be so prejudicial to power, as the proof of its errors; infallibility is necessary to it, and of this the people were well aware when they attributed it to themselves. In the words as well as in the actions of the great, all is instruction; it is false that man is inclined to contend with power; an opinion may be formed from the facility, with which he has for so many centuries accepted error from its hand. Man will always advance towards the truth, which his chiefs point out to him.

Is this the prevailing character, which is sought for, and which one would rejoice to discover in the documents emanating from the Congresses?

However painful the avowal, for the view of the depreciation of legitimate grandeur is always melancholy, we must say, far from it:

and here several considerations present themselves.

By what fatal change has it happened, that, for a long series of years, it might even be said, during the whole course of the revolution, all the documents, which have emanated from the ancient chanceries, have come before the world, under the most unfavourable auspices? What order of ideas have they presented? In what style have they been dressed? What confusion, what obscurity has prevailed throughout them all? With the exception of one or two documents of the British Cabinet, and of the coalesced powers in 1813, commencing from the declaration of Pilnitz, and that of Antwerp on the 20th April, 1792, what has been the real meaning and value of the rest? What has become of all these productions? What traces have they left in the minds of men, and what part of them will history preserve? What comparison can they maintain with the thousands of acts, emanating daily from their adversaries, and which possessed such vigor, such perspicuity. They are the full sonorous tones of manhood overpowering the feeble mumblings of old age. The same contrast may be every where discovered, in America as

well as in Europe; at Washington and Buenos Ayres, as well as at Naples and Madrid; the principle of this difference must exist in the thing itself, for it produces every where an uniform result, and the moment the state changes its form, it changes also its language, rises from its inferiority, and brings its energies into play.

The present King of Sweden has been a model of this new race. Since his accession to the Government of that country, all his words have carried with them a character of natural greatness, of obvious truth, of persuasive clearness, which form the real eloquence of Kings. Can even the ancients furnish us with many speeches, more beautiful than that of the King of Naples on his accepting the Constitution? It is a model of personal dignity, of concession without degradation, of animadversion without bitterness, of sacrifices without an expression of regret: in a word, it is one of those documents, most capable of reflecting honour on its author. Compare this speech with the proclaiming of his royal reinstated government, and again you will perceive the same difference. With respect to the parliament of Naples, if every friend of liberty deplores the violence, to which it has fallen a victim, every admirer of eloquence, (that art

which of all others, most ennobles man,) will shed tears over the closing of its tribune, of which the genuis of Greece and of Rome, appeared to have repossessed itself, as of its ancient right. Yes, this parliament, in which those talents burst forth, which knew so well how to place the rights of the prince in harmony with those of the people, to infuse into the homage of the one the ardour of pure and generous sentiments, and to communicate to the other, that easy condescension, which is the offspring of reason and of confidence; this parliament will be held in eternal remembrance and will be the subject of eternal regret. At the sight of the suddenness and the abundance of talents which burst forth from her bosom the moment they were called into action, Naples was justified in believing, that the brilliant days of the Constitutional Assembly would shine over her also. Madrid and Naples offered nearly the same spectacle: another hemisphere has witnessed the same thing; even in St. Domingo our ears have been struck with the sound of very correct and sometimes very refined expressions.

Where then does the inferiority, and its principle exist? In the ancient chanceries of Europe. I could quote twenty documents

written by them, the one exceeding the other in absurdity; but I abstain from doing so, from a wish to avoid falling from a general observation, into a mortifying censure on particular individuals, which is certainly far from my intention; I shall therefore, confine myself to the consideration of the documents of the Congresses. I have already said, and now recal to mind, that I have divided them into two parts.

The first, which may be called a manifesto against the Revolutions of Europe, and particularly that of Naples.

The second, which is an exposition of the principles of the powers, with regard to sovereignty.

The first presents nothing but declamation, general allegations, accusations without proof, suppositions, and plots, the known facts of which do not afford any traces. In a word, these documents, are only repetitions of other known documents, such as the letter of Count Bernstorff, those of Prince Metternich, and of the President of the Council of Ministers of France, in the month of March, 1820. These documents remind us of the compositions to which we have been accustomed by the *Conservateur*,

and his dull associates, the *Debats*, the *Quotidienne*, and other authors of the same school, and of the same weight. The documents of the Congress, from one end to the other, recal to mind the ideas and familiar style of the whole of this pamphletary aristocracy.* And as this consideration affords me the opportunity, I shall ascend to the source of these haughty, vague, and insulting declamations, which are become the usual style of a certain class of men and of authors.

This carries us a long way back, and is important to be known.

Philosophy, or, in other words, the great social reformation, which was commenced three hundred years back, by the mass of discoveries that signalized that epoch, strengthened, and gaining ground from day to day, by means of the progress of the human mind, viz. by civilisation, which was silently forming a new world, without the knowledge and concurrence of the Governors and the greater part of the inhabitants. This revolution, ripened by time, burst forth at last, at the command of Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau,

* See Burke's Letters on the Peace with the Directory.

and of a thousand others. The human mind rushed forward upon the road they had opened to it. They no sooner speak of man and his rights, of the elements that compose human society, they no sooner ascend to the principle of things, and point out abuses, than a thousand voices are raised to denounce them as the subverters of social order, as the enemies of thrones and of heaven. They call down upon them all the severity of the Executive, the hatred of mankind, and they invoke the arm of justice, who, with too great a compliance for such appeals, compromises herself in an unequal struggle, and promulgates her decrees, of which history has not rendered a very glorious account. And who are the men, who have given vent to this clamorous vociferation? Ministers and Magistrates, who, after having raised themselves to the rank of the advisers of Kings, now proclaimed themselves their avengers, after having maintained a struggle with them for fifty years, which ended by hurling the Monarch into the abyss; for it was certainly *my Lords* of the Parliament,* and *my Lords* of the Clergy and the Nobility, who precipitated Louis the XVIth

* See the *Annales françaises*, by Mr. Salier, *Conseiller au Parlement*, but now Master of Appeals; an author of great veracity, but of not much liberality.

into it. They are priests, who, during two hundred years, agitated France with their miserable quarrels, of which, in these days, one dare hardly pronounce the name. They are Magistrates, usurpers of the power of the nation, as proved by their own confession, in 1787; a confession as public as it was humiliating, and for which they solicited its pardon.

They are Priests, who, forming a separate body in the nation, and living at the public expence, took no part in the common burthens. There was no petty Magistrate, who did not send forth his insignificant requisition, no petty Prelate who did not exhaust his zeal in rhetoric, and in the citation of an order. There was no virtuous and disinterested courtier, who did not fret and fume against that anti-social doctrine, which dared to unveil the abuses by which he fattened. The exemplary manners, the angelic purity* of the latter, were alone sufficient to confound them. All these men, mounted together on their tribunes, talked of nothing but religion and morals and royal power, and a great many other things, which they were as well acquainted with in

* See the Memoirs of the Times, and those by Bezenval.

theory as in practice. Can we imagine a spectacle more offensive to reason, than that of these Catos, these modern Aristides, these new Ambroises, these recent Augustines, who come, in the midst of this frightful disorder of manners and of government, and display their insolent pedantry, whilst the world laughs at their declamations, at the contrast of their words and their actions, and deserts by regiments to their enemies. The great Revolution, in 1789, brought about by the errors of all parties, came at last, and discovered the new world; the formation of which had concealed itself from observation, weakened as it was by sensual pleasures, by ignorance, and the force of habit. What was then seen? A new creation. From that land, which was considered so profane, from those ranks of society which calumniators represented as the sources of public corruption, there suddenly sprang up legions of defenders, of knights of that throne which they had shaken, of those altars which their whole lives had insulted, and to which they attached themselves in the storm, as sailors turn their thoughts towards heaven, amidst the fury of the tempest. Then, their only theme was religion, royalty, morals, and social order. They alone were honest, sober-minded people; all others, whatever their

degree, whatever their claims to respect and esteem, were included in the same anathema, and for ever shut out from the communion of these new saints.

In speaking thus, I am not tracing pictures for the gratification of malice, nor from mere imagination; I am only recalling the history which *I have seen and felt;* and did I not make it my duty to avoid every thing that could irritate individuals, I should not find the least difficulty in naming, even from amongst the Princes of the Church and the first Authorities of the State, numbers against whom, at that period, these anathemas were hurled. There still exist several of the *forty-five gentlemen*, who first passed over to the Commons. Let them recollect the fate with which they were threatened by these saints; and they may, then, be very certain that, in the bottom of her heart, aristocracy has not yet pardoned them. She may make use of them for the moment, but, on the first altercation, the old wound will open afresh. As there never was a cause but what had its writer, so this will find one; and faithful echoes will repeat the same accusations and the same sentences. Events having obliged this Court to hold its sittings on the other side of the Rhine, all these itinerant

virtues increased in bitterness towards their adversaries, and sometimes did not spare even some of their associates, who were animated by a less ardent flame, and were less active in anathematizing their fellow-creatures.

The reign of Napoleon reduced these ex-judges, if not to silence, at least to secret murmurs, and at length all were permitted to rank themselves, in their own right, amongst the number of honest men, and France had the happiness of possessing within her own bosom a much greater number, than eager calculators would readily admit.

The year 1814, restoring the gift of speech to some men, who, fortunately for us, had lost it for some years, or presenting it for the first time to others, whose silence had deprived us of their talents, the torrent resumed its course, and France has again heard men, equally modest and polite, declare to her and her inhabitants, that they alone were honest, that they alone thought rightly. To these preliminary civilities, to this humility, so consistent with religion, they have also added, that they were *the most numerous, the strongest, and the most able;* thus making the *élite* of the French nation to consist of mere dregs—the nation has, it is true, only

opposed to the ridiculous insolence of these boastings, the contempt it merits.

Whence comes this right of reproach, of insulting accusations, of flagrant calumnies, usurped by one class of men, living in the midst of a numerous and regulated society? Whence does it acquire the right of supposing, of imputing conspiracies, perverse intentions and actions, which the accused hold at least as much in abhorrence as the accusers? Where is the spirit and justice of all this? Whence are even the opportunity and the ability to be found, as in questions of right one may be obliged to place a value on such secondary considerations? Are all these Aristarchuses themselves so pure? Where are the proofs of their talents, the monuments of the services, they have rendered to the State? And who do they conceive themselves to be, that they inundate the nation with their proud and insulting cries? Is there nothing reprehensible for them in the cause with which they prop themselves up—in the means which they also know how to make use of sometimes? Have they contributed nothing, at least by their defects, to those misfortunes, of which they are constantly recalling the remembrance, and which are become weakened and tedious by repetition? Do they not fear a just and

very easy retaliation? Is this then the only method of treating matters? And have they sworn to perpetuate that division in the bosom of a family, which it is so easy and important to reunite? Rome and England, when at the highest pitch of national discord, never witnessed any thing similar. Thirty millions of men declared in a state of wickedness. It is only amongst us that such a thing is to be seen. There is only one excuse for such temerity, which is to attribute it to that disorder of the passions, which deprives men of the ordinary powers of their understanding.

I believe I have discovered and can point out the principle of these practices:

1st. That regret of pride, and that fund of aristocratical spirit, by which people conceive themselves the rulers of society; and by which they at once place themselves above others, and summon them before their tribunal.

2d. The feeling of power. When this is depended upon, circumspection disappears with fear, and words acquire a boldness from the hope of impunity.

3d. The weakness of the cause. When the

cause stands on a solid foundation, when its principles are well established and certain, when the judgment upon things is clear, victory follows the principles, and we abandon ourselves to their power; there is no necessity to have recourse to paltry auxiliaries, such as exaggeration, vagueness, insult, superstition, calumny,—these are arms which compose the arsenal of weakness. The writers of this school have discovered and practised a very convenient method, which places them quite at their ease. It is this: they commence by putting a question according to their own fancy, they refuse the combat on its real footing, they garble it, at their own option, they make their choice, they reject every thing that would be likely to annoy them, or that could serve as a corrective; and thus, presenting only the unpleasant or odious side of the subject, they throw upon the whole the wrongs of a part, and attribute to the principal that which constitutes only the accessory, and being thus masters of the ground they have chosen at their leisure, and which they obstinately refused to quit, (and that, for very good reasons,) from this imaginary position they lavish forth abuse, suppositions, calumnies, and convert an ideal mode into the subject of their declamations. This is what we have not ceased to see and hear in

France from 1789 to 1814. The *Revolution* and *Philosophy*, these are the texts of their diatribes. These are the two monsters which are so loudly pursued, with which no terms are to be made, and which are struck with a condemnation *in globo*, similar to that which the Popes vented against the Jansenists. This is the method of arguing, of the whole of this faction, they know no other; they will never distinguish between the real principles of the Revolution, and the deeds of individuals acting in the different positions it has assumed, and in a manner diametrically opposite to its principles. A thousand times have they in vain been told, that no institution on earth could stand such a method of judging; in vain has the authority of Montesquieu been quoted to them; in condemning this general manner of estimating things, he says: *If I were to relate all the evils that religion, monarchy, and nobility have created, I should tell the most dreadful things.* It has been impossible to undeceive them, and whether it be malice, or stubbornness, or dearth of intellect, I cannot precisely say which of the three, or whether it be a compound of them all, yet for them the whole and entire revolution is always on the *place de la revolution;* for them, all mankind and all times, are and always will be —93; they have been

heard to say, in parodying a verse of Corneille, *it demanded its reward, with the head of Louis the XVIth in its hand;* a frightful image, which the slightest sentiment of delicacy ought for ever to have forbidden. Do not attempt to bring back these men by the exposition of any principles, the answer you would receive to whatever you might offer, would be: the human mind is a factious spirit; man does not require sense, it only misleads, it only makes reasoners, that is rebels. Of what use are the labors of the last three hundred years? Had we not the days of yore? What has been the progress of reason? Had we not that of our fathers, civilisation, another intruder, companion of another new comer, perfectibility, and, like her, only tolerable when she increases our physical enjoyments? In that consists her legitimacy, in every thing else her usurpation; nations and their desires do not exist, and what are nations without corporations?——This is, and will eternally be heard, among these men; we must know how to deal with them, for to expect any thing else from them, would be to anticipate a change in their nature. We have had sufficient experience to know how they will be inclined to act.

It has been with unfeigned grief, that I have

perceived almost all these characteristics in the declarations of the Congresses. I respect nothing more, than the government of human societies, and I never feel so much, as when I see the heads of society, by degrading their legitimate grandeur, run the risk of losing a portion of that elevation, to which their sublime functions raise them, and in which I delight to contemplate them.

The circular of the 12th of May, 1821, which is the most remarkable document of all those of Laybach, and is, as it were, the summary of these acts, speaks only of plots, of general conspiracies, of senseless projects, of perverse men, of criminals, of plans to overturn all governments, even republics, and of the centuries of happiness and glory, which Europe has enjoyed under her ancient governments;—this is enough to shew the spirit and style of these documents. I should be glad to learn, what material difference exists between these writings and the *Conservateur Français*. This is with respect to the affirmations. The same may be said of the reservations, for in all that the Congress has advanced, not a word has been said of the state of Italy, of the spirit of the people of that country, of the method or of the promises of the governments, of the progress or of

the aim of the revolution of Naples. Laybach has been faithful to the method we have pointed out:—we will furnish the demonstration.

There is a great difference in the language of the three courts at Laybach, and that which they held in 1813, 14, and 15. The state of the age, the wants of the times, the progress of knowledge, institutions conformable to the state of civilisation, were then the objects in question. In those times, when the recollection of the misfortunes they had experienced, was fresh in their minds, they did not disdain to utter these words; but all vanished with their golden promises; fresh advice was administered by time, and it may, without temerity, be conjectured, that they have supposed themselves less obliged to perform their promises to the people, in proportion as the want of its assistance diminished.

The Allies arrived in France in 1814 and 1815; they remained there until 1818. At these two periods, what did they say? what did they see? what did they do? Was it not the tendency, which has been imprinted by the changes that have taken place since 1789, which they thought the best direction to follow, as being the most likely to pacify both France and

Europe? Then there was no conspiracy seen, no social order reversed; the perverse men had not yet appeared upon the stage. What change has taken place since that time? None, absolutely none; but, to make up for it, a most material one has been effected in the minds of a great many men, and in the position of the different parties. Aristocracy has discovered the means of opening the doors of the cabinets, and of procuring itself the means of restoration in France.

4. The predominant charge in the declarations of the Congresses relates to the conspiracies, which they declare to be formed against all governments. During the last six years, we live in the centre of the system of conspiracies; they are in great repute, and, if they are not put in execution, at least, the people do not refuse themselves the pleasure of proclaiming them. But, amongst all these conspiracies, *which* has been proved to exist with a certainty of evidence, sufficient to justify the clamour that is made in announcing it? for the important air with which their existence is published, and the trifling noise with which they explode, borders upon the ridiculous.

The great conspiracy of the 20th March,

1815, proceeded from the flagrant plotting of thousands of men; and yet not a single person has been convicted of having directly assisted in the return from the isle of Elba. Many joined Buonaparte upon his landing, and during his march to Paris, but not one has been discovered who introduced him. What have we not been obliged to listen to, respecting the conspiracy of the Isère? How have we been wearied out with its continual repetition! And after all this noise, so complete was the proof, that we have seen the Prefect, and the General of Grenoble contradict each other; the Prefect declared, that *the grand battle of Grenoble was nothing more than a paltry skirmish*. Lyons has not furnished us with more distinct intelligence. The 3rd and the 6th were to have brought about another 10th Aug. the proofs were said to exist, and yet the whole is reduced to one soldier vociferating in the midst of a mob. Louvel was incontestably the ostensible agent, the first link of a long chain of conspirators; after having examined twelve hundred witnesses, and after having pressed every thing, that could furnish any clue, the sentence of the highest tribunal of France, declared, that this formidable chief, was himself alone, the contriver of the whole conspiracy. Thus do all these phantoms, which

are the offspring of heads, evidently troubled by *the worst of* prejudices, dwindle away before the light of truth. Four or five hotheaded young men, without family or fortune, dream that they, obscure creatures, are destined as it were to take the King of France by the hand, and conduct him out of his dominions; and this folly, as criminal as it is ridiculous, is given out for conspiracy, likely to have some effect on the government; an insolent fellow, as the Monarch has well said, causes the palace to resound with the noise of an explosion, without any possible aim, and the repetition of this miserable scene in the streets of the capital, by persons equally in the back ground, raises another cry of conspiracy by the *amateurs* of such pitiful manœuvres. And what impression does all this make upon the public, what recollections remain of it? None; they are hardly remembered at all, and the public, tired of all these wretched tricks, take no interest in them, give faith to none of them, feel only contempt for them and their authors, and think no more of them, the day after these grand discoveries have been made. The fathers or godfathers of these pitiful machinations, may be advised to leave off raking up an exploded mine; nothing but shame for them and disgust to the public can be the result. They must provide them-

selves with another patent. Germany has also had recourse to the same springs; there, they have also propped themselves up with conspiracies. When Carlsbad wanted to erect its inquisition, and declare war against the professors and their scholars, it threw itself into the arms of conspirators and invoked their assistance; according to its notions, every one was a conspirator; it passed from one to another, all Germany was to be subverted; the holy Roman Empire was lost, it was to perish like the sheets of some professors, or the antique German costume, which it had pleased some young men to adopt, in order to shew a great spirit of nationality; this was the consequence of the national reaction of Germany against France. By order of the Congress, the Rhadamanthuses, who were charged with the task of avenging the cause of Germany against these terrible conspirators, were assembled at Mayentz, and after three years expectation, the gazette of that town, announced, on the 17th Oct. 1820, *that the commission, in the whole course of its functions, had not had any person, either to interrogate, or to cause to be imprisoned, and that a scholar of the name of Sichel, having been brought before it by mistake, it had declined hearing him!* And now let them talk to us of conspiracies! Sandt was alone and Lænen also, their crimes be-

longed to them only; they were fanatics and nothing more. Every day we see the Tribunals acquit conspirators and their instigators, all the most peaceable rebels, men, the most fit for preserving the public peace; and latterly, a court of justice almost blushing with shame at having to pronounce upon such charges, has unanimously acquitted the supposed agents of a conspiracy, pompously described as being "that of the east," the ground work of which, resembled an extravagant scene from Don Quixotte, or a prefectorial hoax or blunder; for it must be either the one or the other.

Conspiracies have again presented themselves to the eyes of the Congress, and the proofs carry with them the same evidence, as those which Carlsbad had furnished, or the Pope's new bull against the Carbonari. If they had sworn to destroy all faith in conspiracies, they could not have set about it better, and the real conspirators, if such could be found, would be under great obligations to the insinuators of conspiracies, as they may for a long time calculate on the obduracy of the public ear, which cannot be reproached for it, for every thing has been done, to render it hard of belief.

Must it be explained, why conspiracies are always resorted to? The accusation of conspiracies is merely alleged, for the sake of having something to say, for in this age, all undertakings and actions must be accounted for by some pretext, whatever their nature may be. Men are said to conspire, because it cannot be perceived, that it is circumstances which conspire, and the actions of the one are attributed to the other. Some people accuse others of conspiracies, because their judgment is under the influence of prejudice, which shews them things not as they are, but as they desire them to be; not what is really found in them, but what their passions urge them to seek after, and which not to find, would be the highest mortification to them. He then is the real conspirator, who sees, and accuses that, which only exists in his own mind. He is the sick man, whose jaundiced eye perceives the countenances of others discoloured like his own. They say that people conspire, because they themselves are inaccessible to every thing which, beyond the sphere of their faction, could enlighten, present new ideas, or shake the foundations of deep rooted opinions; they appear to have a dread of being obliged to change; their object is not to be enlightened, but to strengthen themselves in their present

views. What but the works of prejudice can proceed from this? And who are the persons forming these Congresses? Are they not the same as at Aix-la-Chapelle and Carlsbad? What preconcerted opinions had they brought with them? Have they summoned any persons but those of their own party? Have they heard any others? And this is called deliberating! Naples has not been able to make herself heard; she was condemned before trial. Such is the real principle, the reunion of the causes, from whence flow all these allegations of conspiracies, always equally destitute of proof; let it not be said, that so many grave personages, who have it in their power to be well informed, cannot be the sport of delusions. England, under Charles the IInd, also possessed many grave men; William the IIIrd was no visionary; yet was that country, during ten years, the ensanguined prey of all the terrors inspired by the conspiracy fabricated by the infamous Oates; it became an article of faith under pain of death; the tribunals, the juries even gave their verdicts according to this impression; streams of blood flowed in consequence of their sentences, *sentences which were always alike;* William lived in his palace, and fed this execrable impostor at the public expence. Hume says, that at

this period, the nation appeared to have lost its senses. A nation may, like an individual, be seized with a panic, which it requires a considerable time to get rid of; at that time, every good English Protestant regarded a Papist as a conspirator, the same as in the good days of the Jansenists and the Jesuits, each of the competitors distinctly recognized an enemy to the altar and the throne, in every member of the opposite congregation. Dreadful effect of prejudice! when the mind is once blinded by it, reason no longer possesses her sway; a species of disease spreads over it, the peculiar property of which is to pervert objects, to make it pursue phantoms, as though they possessed a visible and tangible form; it torments itself, it wearies itself and others, by this fantastical research; it irritates itself at the nonentity of its own labours, and might be supposed urged on by an invisible spur, and after having done an immensity of evil, by violently promoting the interests of a phantom, it awakes as was the case in England at the time of Oates, between regret and ridicule; a conclusion as glorious, for some, as consoling for others, but which unfortunately occurs but too frequently in history.

Nothing of this would happen, if people,

previously to discussion and action, would take the trouble of looking carefully into the nature of things, and if they did not refuse to acknowledge them, when they were demonstrated; this is precisely what has occurred at the late Congresses; they have only admitted those persons who composed the former ones, they have not called in any one else, they have proceeded amongst themselves, the only guide they have had, was the opinion they brought to the meeting, they refused all explanation, all discussion, they have evidently acted under the sway of prejudice, which points out conspiracies every where; they have proclaimed the existence of them, as though it had been clearly proved; they place the greatest faith in the truth of them, but with no foundation; this was inevitable; as for proofs, they have not been able to furnish one.

We will now enquire into the nature of the conspiracy of Naples, and consequently that of Italy; it is that of the world itself, and in this sense, the Congress is right in terming it universal, for it is that of America, of Spain, of Portugal, of the South of Germany, of France; it is that of the recent recollections of Italy, of the desire of separating, at length, from an absolute government, to acquire ano-

ther, which might possess some national quality, and which so many other people enjoy; and not to remain for ever disinherited of the advantages which they are seen to possess; it is that of a feeling of honest shame, at seeing ourselves struck out of the list of nations; it is that of a natural impatience, upon making the comparison of that which we feel ourselves capable of doing, and that which is done with us; such is the conspiracy of Naples, and in such a state of things, it does not require the eye of a lynx to discover so flagrant a conspiracy, the action of which embraces the world and reckons as many accomplices as there are rational beings; but in order to trace this simultaneous and vigorous action to its real origin, and its real end; it is indispensably necessary, that the eyes should not be fascinated either by error, or interest. In all this, there is no idea of the subversion of society; on the contrary, every thing in it tends to its amelioration. Where is the necessity of all these allegations, in order to explain it? Are the revolutions of Spain and Portugal such dark mysteries, so impossible to penetrate? Why, these courts themselves had previously recognized that of Spain, and have attributed it to the truly inconceivable government, under which that country has been since 1814, a go-

vernment which our political professors, at the instigation of the great statesmen of other countries, have recommended to us as the *beau ideal* of the art of governing.

The causes of the revolution of Portugal, are quite as simple; it arose from the incalculable evil, that accrued to the country, from the prolonged absence of the King; the impatience produced by the viceroyship of a foreigner, and by the humiliation of seeing herself reduced to the state of a colony of her ancient colony; it does not require much penetration to perceive how conducive all this was to revolution. But this is too commonly the course of those, who possess power, of those who are subservient to it, of those, in short, who are in expectation of the reward of their interested genuflexions; every thing is allowable in power, it can take any direction it pleases, and sow the seeds of public and private disorder; such is its lot in human nature, and when men, who have suffered a long time, think at last of putting an end to all the ill treatment, which they did not expect to meet with, upon entering into society; when they are anxious to do away with pride, folly, superstition, wasetful expenditure, favoritism, when they wish to look into their own affairs, then they are factious, rebels, enemies

of social order, they are wanting in all their duties, when they themselves take the means of insuring a security, which they would vainly implore, as they know by the most cruel experience. It is engraven on the tablet of absolute power, that subjects must wait till those who oppress them, are tired of the profits derived from their oppressions; every attempt to avoid it, is a crime in every one else; their only resource is to wait, until Heaven shall have softened the hearts of the oppressors. The king of Naples is far from being reckoned amongst them. This prince is amiable and kind, as is the general character of his family. I am aware that his government was not oppressive. On his return in 1815, he carefully avoided the renewal of the horrible scenes which sullied his first re-entry in 1799; this is a terrible epoch in the history of Naples, which ought to be imputed to any one but this prince. At that time, the port of Naples was not far behind the *place de la revolution* at Paris; but all the rights of the people do not merely consist in the absence of ill treatment, and in the non-renewal of grievances too crying, and, it may be said, too heavy, these are not the limits of their social creation; they bring with them rights from their birth; in forming society they possess their rights,

they cannot be stript of them, they have the imperishable right of claiming them; power is only the guardian and preserver of them. Absolute power is not a right but an act, an invasion on social order, and consequently on that of others. It is not a legitimately social power, and when subjects deliver themselves from it, they enter upon their rights, and cannot be blamed for any thing but voluntary violence, for if obstinacy or injuries render it necessary, it comes within the meaning of legitimate defence. On hearing all that is said, one might conclude, that usurpation were impossible, excepting against power, as if power itself were not susceptible of it;—in this sense, every thing belongs to it; but, it is in this sense that it is necessary to examine what has taken place at Naples, and therefore to ask ourselves:

1st. Whether the absolute government be a government socially legitimate, or of the act only, and, in this case reformable by an act similar in quality to that, which established it.

2d. Whether even this absolute government has always been that of Naples, and since when, it has ruled in that country? Is it not only since the end of the Austrian dynasty?

3d. Whether the Constitutional System has not been several times demanded at Naples?

4th. Whether the King did not, in 1815, spontaneously engage to grant this system, as appears by his proclamation of the 1st of May, 1815?*

Moniteur, 5th Jan. 1821.

* In the sitting of the Parliament of the 8th inst. the deputy Podrio delivered a speech containing several passages worthy of observation.

Permit me, said the orator, to deduce my system solely from the facts which have passed under our eyes, which are known to the whole world, and which henceforward belong to the province of history. Some have dared to say, that the Spanish Constitution was proclaimed amongst us by a faction, and that the King was not free when he gave his assent to it.

The ideas, developed by the French Revolution, have had some sincere adherents here since 1795. The government mistook theories for conspiracies, and this fatal error has not failed to produce its effect. Liberal ideas have spread among the higher classes, and the military occupation of 1799 produced a preponderance which rigor has not ever been able to destroy.

The invasion of 1816, and the absolute government which followed in its train, could not root out the love of liberty, which had been transformed into a necessity by reflection, hope and the example of the errors committed by other nations. The Calabrias in 1812, and the Abruzzi in 1813, without any previous concert, began to bestir themselves to obtain a Constitutional System. Sicily did the same; so that neither the separation of the sea, nor the diversity in the government, could disturb the unanimity of the people.

In 1814, the nobility, the magistrates, and the army de-

5th. Whether the King did not establish a parliament in Sicily, during his stay in that island?

If, after these preliminaries, the Neapolitans have had recourse to an insurrection, the least violent and the most temperate it is possible to imagine; an insurrection which has no other object than the reformation of the government, and not in the least of royalty itself; would one not be justified in attributing it to the failure of a solemn promise? Was the king disengaged from his promise, because he no longer felt the necessity of conciliating the Neapolitans? What an abominable maxim would it not be, to cause the validity of engagements to depend on the greater or lesser necessity of fulfilling them?

manded a Constitution from Joachim; it was formally promised, but was not granted until it was too late.

At length the proclamation of the 1st of May, 1815, which his Majesty addressed to the inhabitants of Naples from Palermo, contained these remarkable words: "A firm, wise, and religious government will be established for you; the prince will be the depositary of the laws, dictated by the most energetic and most desirable Constitution."

The return of his Majesty in June, 1815, and his kind and paternal administration have excited the most lively gratitude —they have increased the love of the people without extinguishing in their hearts the object of their ancient affections, and without causing them to forget either recent promises, or this great truth, *Men pass away, but their institutions remain.*

That which has been promised us, is it not ours? That which is due to an individual, is it not still more so to a whole people? Are we to trifle with them, because we have the power in our hands, which is derived from them? Had not the Neapolitans before their eyes, the promises of the same nature as had been nullified in other countries? Can one consistently treat as rebels, and menace with hostilities, those whose actions are, perhaps, the consequences of our own errors? Were not the Neapolitans justified in fearing the same want of faith towards themselves, which they saw fall to the lot of other people? They have taken what belonged to them in their own right, strengthened by the engagement of the king, for every people has a right to a Constitution, otherwise they are but a remove from beasts. This people, it is true, had recourse to momentary violence;—it is an evil, a great evil, which ought never to be introduced into civil affairs; but when one party, armed with power, uses that power for their own personal interests, to the detriment of another party, what is the alternative of the latter? Is this not one of those extreme cases, which constitute a family in a state of warfare? Has not every great change in States been preceded by acts of violence? Are not the acts and the principles in this case ne-

cessarily in opposition to each other, and does not the Tribunal of *success* settle the difference? Look at England in 1688, Holland, Switzerland, the United States, Sweden in 1773, and 1810; in these cases, people depart from society for an instant, in order to return to it again, under better auspices.

It must be observed in this place, that the minds of one party are so partial and so turned to the side of absolute power, that if the acts with which they reproach others, had been committed by its partisans, or in favor of absolute power, there would have been no end to their praises; every actor in this scene would have been a hero. What do they consider reprehensible in Gustavus' driving away the senate of Sweden, taking by famine the ambassadors of Russia and England, and breaking oaths a thousand times renewed? If the life-guards of Madrid had driven away the Cortes, if the canon Vinenza and the curate Merino had succeeded against the Revolution of Spain, we should have seen admirable panegyrics on these *coups de main*. Every usurpation, on the part of absolute power, is erected into a precedent, which is afterwards formed into an incontestible right;—principles of themselves do not form any; and the people have none. History is the

incontrovertible witness of this in all countries, and particularly in Europe, as is proved by the picture of the increase of the power of princes, for the last three hundred years, which Robertson has traced in his admirable Introduction to the History of Charles the Fifth.

To return to the vulgar charges of the subversion of social order, attributed to the modern revolutions, it is necessary to commence by explaining what is to be understood by this term. Does social order exist only in an absolute government? Does the government of itself form the whole social order? Which is the most social, it, or the constitutional system? These are questions which are worth being asked, and which may perhaps damp this ardour for accusation. The substitution of a legal and regular system, for an arbitrary and irregular one, the associating the council of the nation to that of the prince, the equality of legal rights among the citizens, money given instead of being taken, the responsibility of the agents of power, instead of leaving them free from controul—all this is subversive of social order: Oh! too happy subversion, why art thou come so late? England, America, every republican government is then beyond the boundaries of social order? And yet, these societies are found

to be as good as others; but let us know, what principle, what basis of society the revolutions have altered, and principally that of Naples, which has been the object of the most direct attack. The bases of social order are religion, morals, property and royalty, where it is established. In what have they been attacked at Naples? The altar, the throne, all institutions have experienced redoubled respect and homage; not an individual has been injured, *not even a handkerchief has been stolen.* Infamous calumniators; trumpets, paid by those whose interest it is that every thing should be unnatural and blackened, in order to give a colouring to their designs; the *Austrian Observer*, the *Gazette Universelle*, the *English Courier*, all these echoes of the falsehoods and calumnies of a party, have alone been able to take upon themselves the task of making Naples the theatre of imaginary disorders, and which never existed but on the paper, sullied by these scandalous reports. The truth is, that Naples did not cease to present a spectacle of the greatest tranquillity amongst its inhabitants, and of the greatest majesty in its senate. The evidence of witnesses on this point is uniform, and furnishes opinion with a sure guide. Beyond all others, the English were struck with what they had seen at Naples. The facts are evident,

and suffice to destroy the contrary charges. How could the Declaration of Laybach go so far as to say, that the plan of the conspirators went to destroy all governments, even republics? Who could be persuaded of such a thing? What! they whose doctrine, in conformity with their practice, it is, to establish the constitutional order every where, do not desire any, not the least social order? Neither in America, nor in Spain, nor even in France, and yet they are seen reclaiming it, wherever they have only the power of reclamation, and establishing it, wherever they are able to realize it! In truth, these are men of a very particular species;—they do not want what they ask for, nor what they do themselves;—the like was never seen before, and reverses all the received notions on the method of estimating the secret intimations of mankind, which manifest themselves either by their words or by their actions, but which are proved by the agreement and union of the one with the other. But for a revolution in the moral world, one might think one's self justified in judging of the views of mankind by the means of interpreting them. The Congresses have shewn themselves more difficult, and probably it may have appeared to them more expeditious and more convenient to declare their adversaries the enemies of all government, no

doubt leaving to them the care of settling themselves afterwards in a world thus overturned. It would be more easy and more consistent to declare men fools, than to make them reason and act as such.

What is the meaning of the charges brought against the chiefs of the revolution, on account of the evils brought on the country? What injury has Naples received at their hands? The armament has occasioned great expences, but who has rendered them necessary? It was only necessary to leave Naples in peace. It is certainly very logical to attack people, and then to reproach them with the expences they have incurred in their own defence. There is something in this like the derision which strength permits itself to use towards weakness, when enfeebled at her feet.

How, in good faith, can the chiefs of the revolution be reproached with interested motives? It is thus that we have writers who impute the baseness of their own hearts to a Neapolitan General, and facetiously accuse him of having run away with the military chest. Vile thought! indicative of a base soul in him, who could conceive the possibility of such a thing, without having the proof before

his eyes. It is one of those things which an historian may relate, but which a man of honour does not know how to invent. There would be little safety in trusting to men capable of such fictions. From the conception to the execution, the distance might not be very great.

The Neapolitans are accused of having smothered the revolution of Sicily in blood. One might begin by denying the fact. The Neapolitans had nothing to do with the revolution of Palermo. The petty war which it occasioned was reduced to a species of military promenade; and the Neapolitan Generals behaved with a circumspection truly fraternal towards their dissenting fellow-citizens. But, in this case, I should say to the accusers, Understand yourselves; endeavour to be consistent. You, foreigners, come to stifle the revolution of Naples, in order to restore the King to power, and you think it wrong in his generals to stifle one which would deprive him of one-half of his dominions! They have smothered it in blood, and was it with water that you quenched it? And what bath did the Baron de Frimont prepare for his neophytes? I anticipate your grand argument, the insurrection of the army. You are military powers, and it becomes sus-

picious in your mouths. I do not fear to say, it is with grief that I see you place your foot upon this ground. It burns, do not approach this question: *latet anguis;* besides, it is not on French ground, that it could be discussed as it ought. The mind is not in a disposition to admit of such discussions. I agree with you, on all the principles of military subordination, on the enormous danger of the interference of the military in civil affairs. After having made all these concessions, which ought to satisfy you, I request of you, to abstain from all epithets, such as Janissary and Pretorian, which have no connexion with the soldiers of these days. I request of you to consider what the Pepes, the Quirogas, and all those who have appeared at the head of the troops, the executors of the revolution of their country, have demanded for themselves. A circumstance which is very remarkable, and which redounds to the honour of the spirit of the times, is, that this virtue of disinterestedness has not been manifested by some only, but that, whether it be a natural disposition, or the force of example only, it has shone forth equally in all countries, in America as well as in Europe; and this proves the necessity, of discovering some other springs

than those indicated. They are evidently insufficient.

Since the creation of the world, as well as since that of armies, there have occurred a thousand instances of military interference, without one presenting the characteristics which have distinguished those of our days. When these agitations occur for the benefit of absolute power, there is no cause of reproach to be discovered: but if they be in favour of the people, then all is changed, every thing becomes criminal. It appears that justice requires the balance to be held equally between them.

In all this, I think I can perceive great forgetfulness, many pages of history thrown aside, and a strong propensity, to contract the point of view.

The Declaration of Troppau places the revolutions of Naples, Spain, and Portugal, on the same footing. It premises, *that it will occupy itself first with Naples.* The word has gone forth; it was not discreet; it was the sound of the tocsin for the whole Peninsula; it was a notice for her to be upon her guard.

It was probably this, which caused Lord Liverpool to say, that the publication of this Declaration was *the most inopportune and ill-conceived that could be imagined.* Spain and Portugal must have believed themselves threatened as much as Naples. They may have thought, that there was no other difference in their destiny than by the geographical map; and that, if the Peninsula were attached to Lombarby, the same as the *boot of Italy,* it would not fail to be treated in the same manner. Spain cannot be mistaken on the reality of sentiments, which are but too apparent. No doubt, her inhabitants well know, that they are looked upon, with as little good-will as they are at Naples. Fortunately for her, Spain possesses many things which inspire some respect, and which are in her favour: distance, extent, the sea, the Pyrenees, the recollection of the French invasion. Naples possessed none of these ramparts; it was a dismantled place. If the sea, rising on a sudden, between Naples and Lombardy, if the teeth of the dragon, issuing from the earth in armed battalions, in the course of a night, as was the case in Spain, had raised up formidable barriers to the frontiers of the kingdom of Naples, it might have shared some of the respect which Spain has been enabled to inspire.

Sacrifices might, perhaps, again have been made to prudence, to great obstacles; perhaps, the acceptance of this new cup of bitterness might have been coloured by some honourable pretexts. Here again, one of those contradictions I am so often under the necessity of exposing, presents itself. The Declarations make no difference, with regard to principles, between the three revolutions of Spain, Portugal, and Naples! They announce generally the firm resolution of never recognizing the changes, resulting from the rebellion of the armed force; and during this time, Spain herself was recognized, she who had given the example, of whom it might be said, in the sense of these accusers of revolutions, *indè mali labes.* What novel distributive justice! Where are we? To what principles are we to adhere? What? is the most criminal, in a cause absolutely similar, to be absolved? The revolutions of Naples and of Lisbon have not cost a drop of blood; they have not experienced any opposition; unfortunately, as much cannot be said of Spain, and, yet to her nothing is contested. *Dat veniam corvis,* and this takes place under the scrutinizing eyes of Europe! And we are presented with fine paragraphs on the principles and bases of social order! In truth, who are we supposed

to be? What instruction is here conveyed to us? Is this absolution, which seems to be innate with the force allied to power, always inseparable from every thing which can make itself feared? The pirate, then, was right, in saying to Alexander, "*If I had thirty vessels, as thou hast . . . . . ?*"—And Lafontaine, also, in the fable of the Dog and the Wolf, says, "Sir Reynard would willingly have attacked and torn him to pieces, but, as the dog was not likely to submit, without defending himself vigorously, the wolf addressed him in an humble strain."

A bad lesson has thus been given to the world. In cases perfectly similar, there can be but one rule, to accept every thing, or to reject every thing. An unequal treatment only serves to embroil, and to induce a belief of the mockery of justice. This is a jealous God, who suffers no ambiguity, and who desires that his Priests shall be Ministers, having courage to avow him before men, in order to make them his adorers in spirit and in truth.

I should like to hear it explained, upon what ground the Ambassadors of Naples should be rejected in the presence of those of Spain, who were admitted. Can the difference which ex-

ists between them, be pointed out in a clear and not subtly diplomatic manner? For my part, I can discover none. The internal system of Naples, was neither more nor less changed than that of Spain. The changes of the internal system, have nothing in common with the reality of the representation of the Prince, such as takes place by the ministry of the Ambassadors. These are the living word of him by whom they are sent, from whence has arisen the expression adopted in the language of embassies, *the King, my master*. And nothing is more just than this phrase, for they are his word itself, his animated and active representative. From thence their independence and their haughtiness, for they represent a personage haughty from his independence. Hence the termination of their functions, by the death or change of the Prince; for representation ends with the represented, and cannot survive him. But the King of Naples is neither dead nor changed. The credentials of his new Ministers were, in all points, similar to those of the old ones. The second could transmit his words as well as the first. We have not seen that Europe refused to receive the Envoys of Louis the XVIth, on the pretext of changes effected in the interior of his Government. The contrary

practice would render foreigners the judges of this system; but they have only a right to one thing, which is, to ascertain clearly whether the person who deputes, be the recognized chief of the country, in the name of which his Minister speaks. Beyond that, every thing is arbitrary and disorderly. Whilst one part of the Courts rejected the new Envoys of Naples, other Courts received them. Whilst some withdrew their accredited Ministers from Naples, others retained them there. Whilst some Courts expressed the greatest disapprobation of what had taken place at Naples, others felicitated the King, on the changes in the administration of his kingdom. These are the two lines forming a parallel of contradictions, upon which we always find those, from whom we expect instruction; and when we make our own choice, amid the difficulties which these contradictions place us in, then we are daring men, revolutionists, in short, liberals.

It would be doing them too much honour, to discuss the charges, relating to the dislike which a part of the nation and of the army felt, at the revolution of Naples. Facts are a sufficient answer. In every great movement, there are always to be found oppositionists, interests compromised, refractory prejudices,

superiority humbled and discontented, and habits broken in upon. This must have happened at Naples, as well as every where else. They had their aristocracy, their Court, their fat clergy, their monks, very superstitious, and well paid by superstition. Here were certainly ample materials for discontent, but it did not descend into the body of the people, who were strangers to these personal excitements, and who were gainers by the revolution, as is, and ever will be the case, wherever there is a revolution. These accusations must be considered as forming part of that criminatory system which is now well known.

But that which bears another character, and provokes more serious discussion, is the new phrase, by which Napoleon is called the *representative of the revolution*. Let the triumphs over his military oppression be made your theme of the revolve you please.* These triumphs exist; they have been, for they were won in a fair and open warfare. The adversaries of Napoleon may have believed and called themselves oppressed by his military power, but it is not the same thing with the rest. It has been sought to injure him most deeply, by applying to him the word revolution, according to its meaning in this case. This attack may

be answered in the following manner, and those who have provoked these answers, must thank themselves for the stings they may find in them. It is too late to insult Napoleon, when, without arms, after having bowed before him for so many years, when, in his turn, he was provided with them. Armed hands ought to respect unarmed hands, and the glory of the conqueror consists partly in the respect he pays to his captives, particularly when they have fallen under numerical force, and not by the power of genius. It is too late to call Napoleon a revolutionist, after having styled him so long the restorer of social order in France, and through her in Europe. It is too late to let fly a degrading shaft at him, after having held out your hand to him as a friend, pledged him your faith as an ally, and after seeking to prop a shaking throne, by mingling your blood with his. It is with pain that I have seen the Princes of the N. War, flyate in this circumstance, from this to Moscow judicious conduct, I have several times observed them follow, when, after having overthrown Napoleon, they, with great discernment, considered it most prudent, after all that had passed between them and him, not to speak any more upon the subject. On this occasion, they have unfortunately deviated from this

judicious discretion. Their conduct had, until then, formed a noble and enlightened contrast, to what is done in other countries, which have neither done, nor have been able to do, any thing against Napoleon, and where he is still the subject of animadversion.

It is a very false conclusion, that Napoleon is the representative of the revolution. O, how little knowledge, is here shewn of the past! Far from such being the case, the discerning eye will perceive, in this pretended representative, the conqueror of the revolution, which had prostrated every thing at its feet, and overturned and plunged every thing into dismay and terror. It perceives the bank which arrested the torrent, the arm which subdued that Briareus, fastened him to his victorious car, and forced him into his service. And you who now proclaim Napoleon the representat[redacted]evolution, tell us, where would you ha[redacted] if Napoleon, instead of repressing it, with a hand as bold as it was firm, had impelled on the revolution, in that inordinate path in which his predecessors had misguided it; and then tremble at the horrible solution of this awful problem. We must be just, and whatever good or evil may have proceeded from a man, we should know how to

appreciate the elements composing his career. That of Napoleon has hardly any thing, either philosophical or anarchical, in common with the revolution, his greatest tie to it was civilisation, of which he was one of the greatest promoters, and, at the same time, the great victim, in expiation of his separation from her, and of the dominion he wanted to exercise over her.

Let us compare Napoleon with the revolution, and we shall see, what there is in common between them.

The revolution is all principle; he all command.

It is all constitution; he all execution.

It is all peace; it chains France to her frontiers. He, a thunderbolt of war, flying, sword in hand, from Memphis to Moscow.

It is all of limited royalty, and he of absolute power.

It is all equality. He restores the Peers, the Nobles, the Cordon, the right of primogeniture.

It is all liberty. He places it within very narrow limits. You still accuse him of tyranny.

It is all printing. He enslaves it.

It is all against the empire of Courts. He makes a Court of the empire.

It breaks the bonds of France with Rome. He reunites them.

It has demolished and shut the temples. He raises and reopens them.

It has made two Clergies. He recals them to friendship.

It has profaned St. Denis. He purifies it, and offers expiatory prayers to the ashes of our Kings.

It has overturned the throne. He raises it up again, and increases its influence.

It made a Prince Royal of the Dauphin of France. He makes a King of Rome of the heir to the empire.

It has banished from their country the higher classes of France. He opens her doors, and those of his palace to them, although he knows them to be his most irreconcileable enemies, and, for the greater part, incapable of public service. He incorporates them again into the society, from which they had been violently separated.

He is the representative of a revolution, branded with the epithet *social*, who caused the head of the church to come from Rome, to pour upon his head the oil which consecrates diadems.

He is the representative of a revolution, which is declared the enemy of kings; he, who has filled Germany with them, who raised his princes to higher ranks than they had before filled, and by whom, royalty has been resuscitated and renewed.

He is the representative of a revolution, which it is desired should pass for a principle of anarchy; he, that modern Justinian, who has caused all those codes, the least defective of all that are to be found in human legislation, to be written in the midst of the tumult of arms and the snares of foreign policy, and whose hand framed

a form of government, the most vigorous that exists upon the earth?

He is the representative of a revolution, commonly accused of having destroyed every thing; he, who restored the universities and schools, who filled his empire with master-pieces of art; he, the author of the boldest and most extensive works, which have ever astonished and honored the human mind; it is in presence of the Alps levelled at his voice, of the seas overcome at Cherburb, Flushing, the Helder, and Antwerp, of rivers bending gently under the weight of the bridges of Turin, of Bourdeaux, of Jena, of Sèvres, of canals united together in a course inaccessible to the sovereign of the seas; in fine, it is in the presence of Paris, metamorphosed by him, that he is called the representative of a general agent of destruction! He, who has restored every thing, represents that which has destroyed every thing! Again, to what men, deprived of all power of discernment, do they think they address themselves? I should speak much more to the truth, in taking a completely opposite course, and in asking, if Napoleon be no longer at the head of Europe, for he certainly had attained that elevation, whatever may be said of it, and whatever it may have cost to have seen him there—if France has lost her

conquests, is it not the consequence of his having separated himself from the revolution, and having made use of it for his own purposes? Who can say, whether a Consul would not have continued longer than an Emperor? Rome retained hers much longer than she did her new masters? Who can say, whether *citizens* would not have defended their hearths more manfully against strangers, than *subjects* have done? Who can say, to what degree our souls have been softened by the return of a Court, to what degree those armies themselves, those imperial armies, so fine, so devoted, so brave, and often so admirably directed, have equalled the armies of the republic;—what they have profited by exchanging the rough but tranchant steel of the Macedonians, for the glittering gold of the Persians;—whether the armies of the empire could have formed those of the republic, as those of the republic have most certainly formed those of the empire;—to what degree, palaces filled with that species of inhabitants, whose most important affair is the *Judgment of Paris*, have been fit to guarantee to France the legitimate and irreproachable fruits of her revolution? These are grand problems, the difficult solution of which ought to inspire all those, who are inclined to be accusers, with some degree of respect. If men will mutually accuse each other,

there will be much to be said, and human nature will certainly come out of the enquiry with great glory.

If Napoleon has been guilty of excesses, of unjustifiable actions, has he not suffered the penalty? Who pretends to justify them? What have they to do with the Revolution? Are they not to be seen, and in a much greater degree, beyond the limits of the Revolution? Are not some of these terrible *coups d'état* to be found in the pages of our own history? and have they always been forged by the hands of a man, who had to fight his way from the lowest ranks of society and of the army, up to the throne?

The Congress, then, appears to run great risks in thus condemning Napoleon, and in having judged him in his adversity, as he sometimes did others in his prosperity.

It is without the least idea of praise or of censure that I write this; but we must, at length, form a shelter for ourselves, against all such troublesome misconstructions. I continue my examination of them; their number will shew whether they be wrongfully accused of importunity.

A great and too common injustice prevails generally throughout the imputations brought by the Congress against every thing, which it says, forms a party, of which it has made an enemy. According to its views, one might suppose that every man, who is anxious for the improvement of the state of his country, who desires for himself, what he sees in the possession of others, and establishing itself every where, naturally forms part of a body of rebels and of anarchists. All are upon the same footing, without any distinction whatever.

The chiefs, the multitude, even the smallest lamb, (Laf.) are condemned *en masse*. Is this according to justice, to reason, to nature, which has not made all men alike, but differing in a thousand gradations? Very enlightened and estimable men may coincide in some of the political opinions of men of extravagant ideas, or who are little capable of stopping at the right point; so far they may be correct, and so far it may also be right to keep with them, but ought this so far irreproachable connexion to expose one to the anathemas, pronounced against deviations which have nothing in common with the first point of contact, which was the cause of the legitimate connexion, and of which, those who are anathematized, disapprove, perhaps,

as much as the anathematizers? Has this not, however, been constantly the case during the course of the Revolution? Have not thousands of men, honorable in every respect, embraced its principles with transport, and served them with alacrity; but have they not withdrawn themselves with horror from its excesses? Are they then, to be treated in the same manner as the authors of those excesses; are humane and benevolent philosophers to be confounded with a blind and sanguinary mob? And yet such is the effect the Congress produces by the generality of its maledictions. Are not the occurrences, which now happen, the natural consequences of every great revolution? Can one be astonished at discovering some foam on the shore after a storm? Must there not still remain some men of the many thousands, who were agitated by the tempest of several years' duration, and who still preserve the idea of the effervescence, in the midst of which they have lived; are there not some who still glow with that ardour which is now left without fuel, without a prospect, without a present, without a future, and which reanimates itself with the regrets of disappointed hope, and the feeling of great privations? If there be any cause for astonishment, it is not at what does exist, but at what does not; for the history of all great revolutions has uniformly

shewn the same conclusion, accompanied by the same convulsions and the same symptoms. A long time subsequent to the Revolution of 1688, and to the firm establishment of the House of Brunswick, England experienced convulsions, very different from those which the South of Europe, and, above all, France, now suffers, and, in fact, the struggle was not completely terminated, till after the battle of Culloden, the real grave of the House of Stuart.

To avail one's self of a retortion, which gratuitously presents itself, is a very feeble method of argument! Thus, when the Declaration, in order to aggravate the crime of the insurgents, says, "Beneficent Sovereigns, the objects of their people's respect, have been obliged to descend from the throne," at the same time that we acknowledge the justice of such praises, and participate in that interest, which a prince, experiencing such a revolution, inspires, could we not also say, with equal justice and feeling: *A numerous and enlightened people, which has given great proofs of devotion to its princes, which grieves at being effaced from the list of nations, which has waited a long time for the effects of the promises, made to them by the free and spontaneous will of the monarch.*—Would not this recital, and all which might be added to it, furnish great mo-

tives of interest and apology, if it could be required? It appears, that upon this point the Congresses have departed from the real question. That which was discussed between the kings of Naples and Piedmont and their subjects, was not a question of *quality* in the government, either good or bad, but of *right*, of the social contract;—the subjects did not say, *We are badly governed, but we are unduly governed; we have no guarantee, that is to say, no Constitution, and we desire to have one—it is our right.* It appears that, according to the Congress, so long as these princes governed with moderation, and even with utility to their subjects, these had no right to claim, in their own government; it would follow, that because one man superintended the affairs of another well, that the latter would have no right to look into them; but in this, as well as in private cases, the question was one of right and of property, and you must either commence by declaring that nations possess no right whatever, or abstain from these reproaches and these appeals to sensibility. And here, I shall again state, what I have repeatedly observed: there is one paramount question, which will cross you at every turn, which will leave you no peace; it is that of the social contract.—Begin by deciding that, and you will walk on safe ground;

but in your present state you cannot make one step without its stopping you.

With regard to those ages of happiness and glory, of which the Congresses have been generous enough, to make a present to the ancient governments, we should be glad to know the date of these happy days;—we may be permitted to suppose, that their beauty is equal to those invented by our political romancers. We may read history as long as we please, nothing of the kind is to be found;—those who wrote it, must certainly have been blind, since they witnessed nothing of the sort, but, on the contrary, their descriptions form a terrible contrast to this smiling prospect. The Europeans must also be very fickle, or very ungrateful, to evince so much, and such universal eagerness to escape from the charms of this system, the source of so much felicity. The truth is, that the history of Europe is disgusting, and that, till within the last fifty years, it every where presented a chaos of barbarism of ideas and of measures. The most curious circumstance in all this is, to find these panegyrics on ancient Europe uttered by those powers who were the last to form part of European society, several of whom had no fixed title or sensible existence in Europe sixty years ago, whose *debut* on the theatre of

the world has been accompanied by proceedings rather violent, and who have all occasionally presented their neighbours, as in the case of Poland, with those ages of happiness and glory which now await Naples. I conclude these observations on the general charges of the Congress, by a reflection which continually recurs to my mind. How does it happen, that a repetition of things, which have been answered a thousand times, is continually placed before us? What respect, what favour can reconcile us in any cause to the fastidious return of arguments which have been annihilated a hundred times? Without mentioning a number of works which have thrown light on these questions, it will be sufficient to quote Mr. Guizot's book, which sets these questions at rest in the mind of any enquirer after truth. If read without prejudice, this work leaves not the possibility of a reply; the light bursts forth from every page, from every line; conviction reigns throughout. It is the most rational, most substantial writing of our times. If works, such as this, produce no fruits, writing is useless. Is reading, then, peculiar to literary society only? Is political society indifferent to it? Actual occurrences might lead to such a supposition. One might almost believe, that the latter was jealous of authors, and that the former looks upon the latter

as usurpers of their rights, as rash guides, whom their honor requires them not to listen to, for fear of appearing to march only in their train. Men who wield power, generally hold those in contempt who handle only the pen;—they are inclined to look upon them, as lovers of nonentity, whilst they alone dispose of realities, and form correct judgments; the contempt of men in office for authors, whom they favoured with all sorts of epithets, was at its height previous to the Revolution. There was not a petty counsellor, nor a dull financier, who did not, in the bottom of his heart, laugh at all the writers of the age, and who did not consider himself superior to them; an eminent Minister, speaking to the Marshal of Beauveau, of the author of the *Poems on the Seasons*, only called him, *Your poet*. There are a thousand instances of these smart impertinences. When they are confined to literature, they are merely contemptible, but when this contemptuous tendency approaches politics, then it becomes fatal. They who had the direction of affairs, permitted Burke and many others to speak out, and we have seen what have been the consequences. In order that these great statesmen, who are so superior to all advice, so tenacious of any observation, should begin again to read and to listen, it would be necessary that they should cease to

direct. Then reflection would be heard, and these despised books might furnish them with many things, which their position would make them repent not having profited by, and which, placing them in contrast with themselves, would serve as a counterbalance to the numberless flatteries, which surrounded the lofty chairs they used to occupy, and which have not descended with them to the equalising seats of society.

Let us return to Naples, and all the serious considerations her catastrophe gives rise to.

The Declaration of the Congresses alleges the moral captivity of the King of Naples. I begin by declaring, that I do not perceive in what degree this allegation can be serviceable to the interests of this Prince. One thing appears to me very simple, namely, that when one possesses an unanswerable force, the shortest way would be to let it speak for itself, and thus save one's self the trouble of seeking for motives, to which it would be very easy to reply. Every friend of mankind in general, and of thrones in particular, will always be painfully affected by the charges of want of freedom, which had not been touched upon during the whole of the action

agreed to; an allegation that can only be brought forward under the favour, and with the support of force. It would be too late to speak of want of liberty, after six months of oaths, and discussions, and congratulations. What is there binding among men? Mental reservation, or public action? Who can suppose himself bound by this system of absence of internal freedom, which annuls the external consent. This was the road pursued by the Jesuits, to attain their mental restrictions. They spared their time, and, in order to attain their object, they were careful not to complete their journey in a single day. What! was not the King at liberty, while the rest of his family continued his work, according to his orders? If a people were to give their consent thus, would it afterwards be permitted to allege violence experienced? When any act has been performed against it, is not its simple submission, which it has no means of refusing to authorities armed by the public power, is not the simple execution of this act objected to it the moment after, as a formal acceptation, as a bond, which it is no longer in its power to annul? And can the Prince do what is not permitted to the people? Are the people like the hereties, with whom, the ancient Jesuits said, no promises were to be kept. For the

honour of mankind, for the honour of thrones, let us leave these crooked paths, in which good faith is led astray, is lost, is vilified." It alone is the universe and its support. The liberty of a particular Prince, or of a particular people, is not necessary to the world, but good faith is requisite. Princes and people have passed away; good faith remains. Ages, which devour every thing, serve only to its further confirmation. The world is not in want of an individual, whosoever he may be, nor even of a particular people; its wants extend to the whole species; but it cannot dispense with morality and the evidences of morality, as a general light, convincing, irresistible, from its universality and clearness; nor can it be reconciled to a supple, pliable, ambiguous morality, conformable to the desires of interest or of force. Such a morality is its mortal enemy. What could be done with a people, whom, after a lapse of six months, you would inform, that all it had seen and heard, all the preparations that had been displayed before it, were but a vain shadow, a mere covering, to hide the reality, contrary to the appearances which had arrested its attention? Such casuists would dissolve the world, whilst good faith would preserve it.

Detestable doctrines have too long reigned over this fundamental principle of the moral life of man. Compliant moralists have placed this sovereign of the universe at the feet of power. The tiara has severely wounded it, in raising itself above morality, by the awful prerogative of disengaging itself from the faith of an oath. Francis the Ist lost the flower of that chivalric honour, to which he, notwithstanding, attached a great value, by protesting against a consent, forced from him by treatment unworthy of him. The fault, however profitable it may have been to France, cast a blemish on his honour, in the eyes of history, and exposed him in his lifetime to the most grievous reproaches; for honour does not consist in the advantages of a subterfuge, but in the acceptance of sorrow, for the purpose of preserving it without stain, and of obeying its rigorous laws. Regulus, the martyr of faith, teaches, from the depth of his tomb, the value and price of its crown. He was not acquainted with mental reservations. The French King, who was the author of that admirable maxim, *that if good faith were banished from the society of man, it would be found in the heart of Kings*, (a sentiment for which antiquity must envy France,) and who, by seeking death instead of capti-

vity, proved that this heroic sentiment had passed his lips, and entered into the inmost recesses of his heart; he also estimated faith at its real value. The prisoner of Savona attracted the homages of the universe, by his constancy in suffering every thing, rather than adopt what he considered inconsistent with his duty. I admire the conduct of the last King of Sardinia, in abdicating, rather than be forced to accept that, which was repugnant to him. Both these actions teach a great lesson, for nothing speaks more forcibly than candour, and the absence of all dissimulation: whether we accept or refuse, the golden rule is, to perform what we have promised. Good faith in one is the seed of good faith in another. But when, after a long time, violence is alleged, which was not pleaded in proper time, when the charge is seen supported by force, and, above all, by foreign force, then the magical part, or, in other words, the morals of society vanish, and leave nothing in their stead but brute force and the germs of mutual deception; a seed which grows strong and quick; then the vulgar think that society consists solely in being the strongest. Detestable instruction! More evil springs from only one of these actions, whence pro-

ceed effects so fatal, than from all the doctrines which have been loaded with so many reproaches. *In moral policy, as in religion, without faith there is no salvation.* It has been, therefore, with real grief, that I have perceived this charge in the Declarations of the Congresses. They are not sufficiently observant of the honour of thrones, which my eye always wishes to perceive, like stars without clouds. Subterfuge is unworthy of them. I recognize thrones and their honours in the noble candour of an acceptance or refusal, equally open and sincere. But to agree, to reject, to advance, to retire, to undermine what we cannot openly destroy, to await the moment for declaring one's self, to invoke foreign aid clandestinely, and to make use of it for the breaking of engagements; to raise the voice under such support, after having spoken quite softly in its absence; to banish, to proscribe those, whom before had been caressed and honoured, to put forth a doctrine which undermines every thing, that had been previously advanced, then the throne falls from the moral elevation on which I love to contemplate it. There I find men and their passions, and it is not them I seek, in the high region which it ought to occupy.

Emigration,* by constantly representing itself as acting in union with Lewis the XVIth, writers, courtiers, and all persons equally thoughtless, who endeavoured to create a belief that this monarch did not act according to his own will, and who persuaded him to adopt the declaration which accompanied his unfortunate flight to Varennes, attended but little to the interests of this unfortunate Prince; they ought to be placed in the number of those ill advised friends, whom, in his will, he forgives for the great evil their inconsiderate zeal brought upon him. The remonstrance of the Congresses respecting the moral captivity of the king of Naples, are not more favorable to the monarch. It is to them, that every thing blameable in all this must be attributed, for this Prince never uttered the least complaint on this head, and he was certainly the person from whom it should have proceeded. Neither

* See the Memoirs of the Marquis de Ferrieres, a ministerial member of the Constitutional Assembly, much devoted to the aristocracy, and a great enemy of the revolution, but a man of honour and intelligence, that is to say, a man of enlightened impartiality. He does not trifle with the revolution or its authors, but faithful to the truth, he frankly relates, what he has seen, without regard to the consequences, which may fall upon his own system; his work is calculated to rectify many opinions, falsified by contrary interests, and to impose silence on many babblers.

when he was at a distance from Naples, on board an English vessel, nor during his prolonged stay at Florence, and at Laybach, after the success of the Austrians, which afforded him an opportunity of speaking without fear of contradiction, did he let a word escape him, which could be construed into an intention, on his part, of taking advantage of the moral violence he might have experienced. Every thing that took place between himself, the Duke of Calabria, and the Parliament, at the time of their separation, and the magnanimous and confident reliance of the latter, all demonstrate the liberty which this Prince enjoyed. But since the Congress has advanced this pretext, might it not be told, that it had itself deprived this Prince of liberty? Having, previously to his departure from Naples, declared, that he would not accept of any thing contrary to his engagements, and prayed Heaven to give him strength sufficient to perform his oaths, what does he find at Laybach? The impossibility of being heard, the only alternative of submission or war. It was there that he was not free, and that, by the means of those very men, who accuse others of having deprived him of liberty. For such language was certainly never addressed to him at Naples, and if he felt himself restrained, he might always have done

what the King of Sardinia has so nobly put into execution. It may be seen, that the Congress has not examined this very narrowly, for on the one hand, the charge is unsupported, and on the other, it is far from being exempt from objections.

With regard to the vulgar pretexts, drawn from *necessity*, as a means of justifying dissimulation, I shall use the words of Madame de Stael, who when replying, in her *Dix années d' exil*, to this unworthy excuse, exclaims, with justly irritated feelings: *Necessity, will it be said? There is a sanctuary within the soul, where its empire should be unknown; if it were not so, what becomes of virtue upon earth? it would be a polite amusement, which would be convenient only to the peaceable leisure hours of private individuals.* The Congresses represent, as matters of reproach, the movements which occur at different places at the same time. The simple universality of this motion is sufficient to indicate its nature; it belongs to a general order, like effect, like cause, and *vice versa.* A political interest being a private interest, is limited in its nature; a social interest being a general interest, knows no limits, all can partake of it; this distinction suffices for the explanation of the whole. But how is it

possible, not to recognize the social nature of the movement which is felt? When did ever one exist, which bore these characteristics in a more striking manner? Observe what occurs in the whole world; on perceiving its action, one might suppose one's self assisting at its second birth; we follow distinctly the new moulding of its institutions; the movement is *neither French, nor German, nor Italian,* as the Congresses represent it alternately, *it is human.* If they did not give faith to me, when I laid this evident truth before them, in the Second Part of Carlsbad, page 175, let them hear M. de Serres, the Keeper of the Seals, in France, declaring in the sitting of the 12th April, 1821, that *human society is in labor.* I congratulate myself on having met with this minister; he has stated the question admirably, and as the necessary effect of the just stating of a question, he has resolved it, in putting it. Yes; human society is in labor, and that is all; it brings forth, and never did a similar delivery take place without a powerful, long, and grievous labor. Such is the entire truth, which dispenses with all the senseless declamations, with which we are overwhelmed. Let us observe the constant direction of the world, we shall there find safe guides for our opinions,

and at the same time, we shall discover that its present march is the one it has always followed. Every grand epoch has had its peculiar spirit, and has reckoned an action which has become the subject of its occupation, and the end of its movements. Attend to this, I beg of you. Christianity appears, and during the five hundred years occupied by its establishment, it fixed the attention of the world; every thing relates to it, either for or against. The Reformation attracts the same attention during a hundred years; the Indies, America, are revealed to the world, every one throws himself at once into this new career. In the thirteenth century, the pandects of Justinian are discovered, all minds turn to this new object, all studies are directed towards them, all pulpits resound with them, the world then turned towards the civil right, as it does now towards social right. Does not this general impulse of the thirteenth century, appear to present us with that, which directs the nineteenth century towards social right, and which the revolution has introduced into the world? All the institutions of Europe have also formed themselves alternately, in a general manner; the feudal system established itself at once, absolute power the same; national representa-

tions date from periods very close together;* the Hanseatic towns of Germany, and Italy, became free at the same time, and after the example of one another. The Crusades occupied the minds of all the inhabitants of Europe at the same moment, and continued to do so during two hundred years; this fever communicated itself to all at the same time. The minds being once turned towards a contemplative life, the world was covered with hermits and convents; when the fervor of these was damped, secular congregations succeeded each other, at intervals of a few days only. It will be seen, therefore, that, at all times, the human mind has proceeded by general movements, and by masses of occupation, and consequently, that, with which it is now reproached, as being an injurious, *revolutionary, liberal* novelty, is nothing more than it has always admitted and its ordinary and natural proceeding.

* See Robertson's Introduction to the History of Charles the Vth, and Rhulière in his History of Poland, vol. i. p. 27. He assigns the periods of national representation, as follows:

England.....	1265
Germany.....	1292
France.....	1303
Scotland.....	1306
Spain	1350
Poland.....	1467

This consideration leads me to remark, how little historical observation enters into the calculation of the greater part of those, who wield power; the trifling consideration they appear to bestow upon it, might lead us to suppose, either, that history does not exist for them, or that it incommodes them.

From what has just been said of the uniformity of the action of the world, the force of example, (that powerful spring, which prevents the necessity of invention, and which can proceed so far as to stifle remorse) particularly shines forth, man is naturally imitative, and have nations, in the aggregate, like individuals, any other tutor than example? If man imitates in futile and indifferent things, how will he not imitate, when the example turns upon objects, from which he hopes to reap the choicest fruits, and in this case, is the force of example any other than that of human nature, which inclines to a search after the means of well being? And what want of reflexion is it then to be astonished, to be vexed at a thing so just and so simple?

But among the accusers of the present time, are there not some to be found, who belong to

the pretended reformed religion ?*. I may be permitted to qualify it thus. Was not the Roman worship that of their forefathers? Had it not procured for them, ages of happiness and glory? From what period does that which they follow take date? Has it always triumphed peaceably? Did not those Princes, who seceded from Rome, the precursors of the measures, with which the revolution has been so greatly reproached, seize upon the property of the Church? Did they not favor, even for the interest of their personal luxuries, the marriage of persons, consecrated to the exclusive service of the Church? What was to be heard then, what authority was their support? Were they not the rights of humanity and the slavery imposed by Rome? The Reformation also promulgated its *declaration* of the rights of man, and if he, whom it termed antichrist, and head of the prostituted Babylon, had fallen into its hands, we may conjecture, that it would not have given him a million to hold his court at Savona. The whole of this has been proved by Bossuet. And on her part, what did Rome say at sight of this schism in her deplorable family? What

* I hope that no one will mistake my intention; I know the rights of toleration; I am writing on politics and not on theology; I oppose one direction, and not one doctrine to another.

did she think of the vast conspiracy that deprived her of her dominions in the North of Germany, and which put in question, the possession even of the Kingdom of her elder offspring? Did she not then accuse the aberrations of the mind, the violence of the passions, the interested views of chiefs? Did not she, in her turn, tax the human mind with want of discipline, and with idle curiosity? Did she not make a pompous display of conspiracy, as is now the case? And notwithstanding, its authority proceeding from a divine source, fortified by a peaceable possession of fifteen hundred years duration, possessed a weight which cannot be found in purely human authorities, pronouncing on human affairs, according to human principles, which are contradicted by authorities of the same nature, and which explain questions perfectly similar, in quite a different manner.

Are we not, in this case, anthorized to say to the author of the accusations which are now under our consideration, and who belong to the number of sectarians of the new worship: You celebrate the secular feasts of your separation from your august and ancient mother; you render public homage to those, who have torn you from her bosom, and at this very moment you are decreeing to them, the honors of an apo-

theosis: you erect statues to the *Mirabeau* of the reformation: you transform Wittemberg into a pantheon for the chief of your religious revolution; royal hands have placed the crown upon that head, which was struck by the anathemas of the ancient religious system, by the thunders of the Roman and Catholic aristocracy, and in whose eyes, you are but a democracy, as which it has not ceased to accuse you; on the other side, you storm against those, who in a much more problematical order, only march in your steps, and in their turn, dare to invoke that reason, which you have made your Gospel, nay more, which you have made the judge of your Gospel. The world is now performing the part you acted then; it also appeals to reason; it searches for guarantees against the oppression it has experienced, as you then sought for them; it has learnt to read in the book of nature and of right, as you had learnt to read the Scriptures, which you examined; how can you be surprized at its executing in sociability, that which you did in religion? The present revolution has unfortunately cost much blood, yours caused it to flow in torrents; then you accused your enemies of this horrible necessity, now the revolution casts the same reproach on its adversaries; you were the liberals of your times as we are of ours. It is

not worth while being so vociferous when the resemblance is so great.

I really do not know what a reformer, in good faith, could answer to this language. For my part, I am certain, that at Rome and many other places, it would be considered as *just*. Such is the power of *true* appreciation.

Real Causes of the Neapolitan War.

It has been demonstrated, 1st, that the Congresses were incompetent to act with regard to Naples: 2dly, that all their charges against her were false; and notwithstanding, they have acted against that state. Upon what principle can such an action be founded? Three actors are here brought to view. Russia and Prussia, cannot have any direct contest with Naples; they are not competent, as Austria is, to say, *your neighbourhood renders me uneasy;* for, with regard to those two Powers, Naples is placed in the same situation that the lamb in the fable was to the wolf.*

* Let me request your majesty, not to give way to the violence of passion, but rather to consider, that I am quenching my thirst in the stream far below yourself, and that consequently, I cannot, in any way, disturb the pureness of the water you are tasting.

The three powers, however, have evinced perfectly similar dispositions, in very different positions; whence can this conformity arise, unless it be from an equal and uniform principle, which unites them, notwithstanding their difference on other points? But what principle can this be? One only—the method of governing. And what is that of the three Powers? Absolute military. Which are the three revolutions denounced by the Congress? Those of Spain, Portugal, and Naples. How have they been effected, and with what intention; Their aim was a Constitution, and the means military. There exists then a direct opposition between the nature, and the agents of the revolution, and the nature and supporters of the government of the three Powers. According to the progress of constitutional establishments, the latter form a separate society in Europe. They have already sufficient occupation with the Constitutions established in Germany, as is acknowledged by Prince Metternich, in his letter to Count de Berstett; they are assiduous in preventing the multiplication of these disagreeable constitutions, and during this time, it bursts forth at the extremity of Italy; the dispositions of this country are familiar to them: if the revolution succeeds at Naples, all Italy will certainly follow its ex-

ample; Austria trembles for that portion of the country which she has adjudged to herself; *absolute military* finds itself threatened more and more, and its territory straightened; either the progress of constitutions must be arrested, or *the absolute must be abandoned*; there is no alternative. In this state of things, the three Powers have renewed the manœuvre, in opposition to the constitutional system, which they had adopted against Napoleon; when he proceeded from conquest to conquest, to the root of these three states, and they found themselves seriously threatened and pressed by a common danger, they united together, supported each other, and, by the weight of their concentrated mass, they overwelmed their enemy. They are doing the same against the constitutional system and by the same reason, it has reached their gates; there the absolute must either admit or repulse it; this is what has been done in the attack against Naples; it has been the object of their search, and would be the same in Spain, in Portugal and wherever it could be attained. To circumscribe it in one place, prevent its breaking out in another, such is the secret of the conduct of the absolutes. I do not reproach them for this conduct, they only seek to preserve themselves: I only explain it, for with them it is a necessity: I only draw

aside the veil for those, who did not comprehend it; and perhaps for themselves, they may have followed their natural instinct, more than their judgment. This method of estimating the direction of the powers, confirms itself by the contrast, which the conduct of England and France presents? They have refused to join in this crusade, and why? Because, being *constitutional*, their principles could not accord with those of the *absolutes*. They have responsible ministers, *the absolutes* are responsible only to God. How could England have acceded to the league of *the absolutes*, after Lord Castlereagh had declared, *that the principles of the Allies were incompatible with the fundamental laws of Great Britain?* However devoted and aristocratical the House of Commons may have become, it has not deserted all the principles of the British Constitution; it remembers, that it does not owe its existence, and its privileges to the armed interference of foreigners, and of the absolutes. A minister countenancing other principles, would lose all credit in the House, and in the nation, for ever: nor would a well advised minister ever furnish the Opposition with such subjects of triumph. Whatever latitude the charter may leave to the ministers in France, as to foreign affairs, however effectually legal responsibility may be

wanting, yet there exists a moral responsibility, whether it be in the chambers, or in public opinion, which serves as a check upon ministers, and prohibits their associating themselves to whatever the agents of a power, which is responsible only to God, may permit themselves. These have no other limits to their words and actions, than those of their power; whatever they can *do*, they may *say*. It is in perceiving the circumspection, of which the constitutional system obliges the observation in the sight of others, that we learn to recognize the excellence of its properties; for then we discover in it, a protector, even for those whom it does not directly govern; its benefits extend beyond the limits of its jurisdiction. The ministers of absolute power, freed from these shackles, have proceeded according to their will; they have given to their acts, the colour which they thought proper, and which they would not have been able to do in a system of legal or moral responsibility. Naples has been stript of her constitutional system, and restored to the absolute, because Austria, and her allies are not constitutional.

If social order were the only aim of their efforts, as the Congresses declare, it would have been sufficient to separate every thing

from the revolution of Naples, that was offensive to that system. The parliament had been created by a popular commotion, this was evidently the fundamental reproach. The Spanish constitution displeased them; the throne was not gifted with sufficient power and all this might have been reformed, purified and extended to its just limits; the King had announced it on his departure.* General opinion in Europe was in favour of its reformation, the general hope was, that it would not be opposed; the original blemish of the constitution might have been effaced, without destroying its principal result, and even in improving it; that would have united all the interests of social order and the Neapolitan people; but that was not the aim of the *absolutes*. What it requires, is not the quantum or excess in a constitution, but that there should not be any whatever, as the example of Prussia exhibits, which has left its monarch free to grant a constitution, but has not been able to obtain it; not that there was any thing wanting for the formation of a very perfect one, but that it was not compatible with absolute power. The latter could not sympathize with the other, and could not admit the constitu-

* See the King's message to the parliament at the end of the chapter.

tional system without annihilating itself. In order to remain, it shut its doors upon it. Thus it has happened, that Naples, instead of receiving a regular Constitution at the hands of its King, has only seen the institution of Councils and States, which were the King's own work, but which had neither the form nor foundation of a Constitution. It was the same in Piedmont. The King declared, that he came to exercise the plenitude of regal power, that is to say, to be absolute; and he has not experienced the slightest opposition on the part of his allies, of those to whom he was indebted for his re-establishment. This arises from his being certain of acting according to their wishes. The sincerity of the King of Naples, in the announcement of the resolutions, of which he assured the Parliament at the time of his departure, cannot be called in question. Who, then, has prevented the effect, and caused them to terminate at a perfectly opposite point? It does not require any great strength of penetration to recognize the influence of the absolute power of his restorers, to whom the constitutional promises of the King were not very agreeable. In vain will it be said, that the internal arrangements of his country have been left to the Prince. The proof of the contrary exists in his engagements

at Naples and his proclamation at Laybach, his oaths and his council of state. The distance between the one and the other is too great, not to lead to the supposition, that the *absolutes* have placed themselves between them, in order to fill up the vacuum by which they were separated.

In speaking of absolute power, as being that to which these three powers are attached, I am far from applying to it those unpleasant ideas, which this word alway recals. It is not my fault if it carries grievous remembrances with it. Despotism has done so much evil to the world, that it is always with fear and distrust that men perceive its image, whatever veil may be thrown over it. In this work I only quote absolute government as a fact, as a mode of government in force in the States, of which I speak, without such mention bearing any allusion to the manner in which it is exercised. I know that it is unaccompanied by any violence with princes of an elevated and humane character, gifted with great intelligence and love of civilisation;—I only present it as a concentration of the powers of the whole society in the hands of a single person, and in opposition to the constitutional system, which permits all the citizens to partake of it. The

happiness of man is not incompatible with despotism, exercised by virtuous and enlightened despots; history presents many examples of this; despotism names, as it were, for its absolution, the Tituses, the Trajans, and the Antoninuses. The government of Denmark is certainly a pure despotism, for there is no species of power which it has not attributed to the king; the character of the princes, by qualifying the mode of government, has rendered this despotism, as it were, imperceptible, and the Danes are happy under it;—if they perceive that they live under a despotic rule, at least they do not feel that they are governed by a despot. The Russian government is a violent despotism, for it is a real Asiatic government; the virtues of the present sovereign render its asperities imperceptible, and turn this unlimited power to the benefit of the subjects. Therefore this discussion does not, in any manner, bear upon the exercise itself of power, but upon its nature, which forms the *absolute* and *arbitrary* system there, where one only commands and acts without responsibility. It was thus that the Greeks gave the general title of tyrants to all those who possessed themselves of power in those cities which were free, and that, without any distinction of the manner in which they exercised it; tyranny was to the Greeks, those

first-born sons of freedom among men, the possession of popular powers. The feeling of liberty is so innate in man, that he is always inclined to brand every thing which deprives him of it; and despotism, whatever title it may assume, will always bear an evil character in his eyes.

Rights of Sovereignty according to the Congresses.

This is the important article, the foundation of the Declarations of Laybach, that which it is most important for Europe to be acquainted with, and, consequently, that which it is our duty to bring under observation.

In this work, as well as in several others which have preceded it, I have insisted on the necessity of fixing the nature of societies; of declaring what is recognized in them, and to give that degree of clearness to these definitions, by which we may at length know, whether they be associations governed by their own laws, having an eye to their best interests; or whether they are only so many masses of men, who can be moved only by the spontaneous and unquestionable will of their chiefs. This is, as will easily be seen, the whole and ole question of the social bond The Declaration of Lay-

bach has decided this question in peremptory terms, for it says: "*That all useful and necessary changes in the legislation and the administration of States, ought to proceed solely from the free will, the considerate and enlightened impulse of those whom God has rendered responsible for power. Every act that deviates from this line, necessarily conducts to disorder and confusion!*" Here, then, all doubts are solved, and after this declaration it is evident, 1st, That the entire sovereignty is vested in the prince; 2d, That he, being responsible to God only, holds the power from him; 3d, That the people can do nothing of themselves, and ought to look only to the sole will, the *motu proprio* of the prince: the consequences are evident. By this it appears, that the social contract is nothing more than the good will of one, and consequently the declaration returns to the point which I have indicated, as being that which incessantly obtrudes itself, namely,

1st, To treat upon the Social Contract.

2d, To be in opposition to the rest of Europe and the world.

As to the first point, the social contract is certainly that which is held in view when it is declared, that there exists no contract between

the prince and his subjects; that they ought to look up to him for every thing, and that, on his part, he is responsible only to God. The question is thus cut short. The different societies are no more than dominions under the chiefs, or rather, there exist no longer any societies; a society without any participation in the acts of the society, a society under an absolute chief is nothing less than an absurdity, a contradiction; whenever absolute power speaks of social order, it cannot understand itself.

At length, thanks to the declaration, we know what we have to expect, and what our situation is in the list of mankind, viz. the prince is every thing, the people nothing, God is the Judge.—By these traits we may recognize absolute power.

As to the second point, we are again thrown into our usual contradictions; for, whilst Laybach sets up its absolutes at its pleasure, what in the mean time is the doctrine of the greater part of Europe and of the whole of America? Is it also in the midst of the millions of men, who inhabit this space, that absolute power is set up; is it there also said, that every thing comes from the prince, and that he is acccountable to God only? Who would hear or repeat one of these

words in England, Spain, Portugal, Sweden, the Low Countries, the South of Germany, in France herself, excepting aristocracy itself, which is always breathlessly reaching after absolute power; or, in the United States, in America, St. Domingo, even among the Mulattoes and Negroes? This language separates the rest of the world from those who govern it;—governments formed upon similar principles form *oases* in the midst of modern civilisation, and speak the language of people retrograded in civilisation. If England refused to associate herself with the doctrines of Troppau, upon the plea of interfering with the domestic arrangements of States, with what energy would she not repel the seal of slavery inflicted on the front of mankind, which turns human society into an appendage on the will of the chiefs, and this charter of impunity, which the governments have arrogated to themselves, in acknowledging themselves responsible to God alone? What minister, what deputy, would ever dare to utter one syllable of all this? In England this doctrine would be ridiculed, and would lead to the scaffold. According to her ancient laws, France is as yet but imperfectly constitutional; but nevertheless, the law and the maxims which have prevailed there, keep her free from such doctrines.

The same declaration asserts, that the invariable principle of the Powers is, to maintain every thing as it is legally established. Prince Metternich had already expressed the same in his famous letter to Count Berstett.

But here, we are again surrounded by uncertainty, and these relapses very frequently occur. An invariable principle is laid down; but can it be supposed, that such a principle could be involved in the least obscurity? Is it not necessary that it should carry its own definition along with it, and such a definition as shall be generally received and understood? If it be 'comprehensible' to its authors alone, how are we to understand one another? But it is necessary to explain what is understood by legally established, in what this legality consists; whether the legality *de facto* carries with it the legality of right, how long a space of time it would require to constitute the legality of facts, and to change it to one of rights; whether the Authorities of the Directory, of Napoleon, and of Murat, were to be regarded as such; for they were recognized, Ambassadors were appointed to their Courts, and no difference was made in the manner of treating with them, and with the other Princes. Would one be supposed obliged to support them, as well as the others? Are the people to look upon

themselves as obliged to support all the legal establishments, wherever they are to be found? Are we under the necessity of recognizing this jurisdiction, when the means of evading it are placed within our reach?

I insist upon this article, because the cries of aristocracy, calling for mediation, still resound in my ears. I keep within my view the crooked paths, by which several writers endeavour to mislead the public, and by which they strive to rebuild the doctrine of absolute power, by rendering the Prince the exclusive source of the social powers, and to reduce the Constitutions into mere auxiliaries of the Government. It is thus, that at Rome, the Pope arrogates to himself the source of Episcopacy, so universal is the inclination to the extension of power, and the desire to concentrate it in one's self. Upon this principle, the power of the people lies within a simple form. The only thing required is to give the legal form in such a manner, that the participation in the legislative power shall not stray from its proper course, but shall be only an emanation from a concession, granted by the supreme Power, in which the very essence of sovereignty resides, and which only admits the people to a participation, in order to authenticate its own acts. Upon this system, all idea of

society vanishes; the power is established beyond the range of society; the people are reduced to the mere countersign of the acts of the superior powers; the political assemblies are but registers of the form and legal preservation of acts, emanating from the real Sovereign, of which they form no part. This is the necessary consequence of the demi-official Declaration of Laybach. (See it at the end of the chapter.) The meaning of these words is too clear to admit of their sense or tendency being misunderstood. They attribute the entire sovereignty to the Prince, without any distinction of pure or limited monarchy; for the sovereignty belongs incontestably to him who is the source of it, and who also possesses the power of the laws. It does not, in the least degree, appertain to him, whose power does not exceed the simple application of the form to the legal act. He is merely a secretary, a mechanical instrument. All Parliaments would have revolted at the idea of being reduced to that, which is accorded to the people, and yet this is all that Laybach grants to the people, acting by its representatives; and, with regard to those States without representatives, they are cut off still shorter; they have no power at all. Miserable human species, how art thou treated! How

do miserable sophists honour thee, for the benefit of their own interests! How do despicable and faithless authors lend themselves to the propagation of anti-humane doctrines! How soon are those circumstances forgotten, which took place in England during the long battles, in which the Civilians sustained a furious warfare in favour of absolute power, fell back in a thousand different ways, and disputed their ground inch by inch. Not succeeding in their attempts to establish the law of divine right, they maintained that of dispensing with the execution of the laws, and fatal alike to both Prince and people, they ended by precipitating both into the terrible revolution of 1688. Such is the end which is threatened by the thirst for power, by the sophisms, which endeavour to sustain and extend it, and by the misfortunes of those whom it overwhelms; and when they have been driven to despair by these desolating doctrines, then they are accused, they are called factious and rebellious.

My aversion to the doctrine of Laybach is increased, when I find it disseminated amongst us, in our Chambers, in the mouth even of the Keeper of the Seals, who, in the Sitting of the 8th May, 1821, spoke thus:—"The Chambers

being, according to the terms of the charter, forms of the King's Government, there is no doubt, that they are within the limits pointed out by the charter, viz. associated in the exercise of the royal sovereignty, or, in other words, that they are only forms, by which, in certain cases, the King exercises the sovereignty in a more imposing, more solemn, and more irresistible manner."—Moniteur, 10th March, 1821.

I have applied myself very earnestly to discover the meaning of these words, but I have never been able to find any other than the one indicated above, viz. that all power, vested in the representative assemblies, is granted to them from above, and that their functions are restricted to the legalising, by certain formalities, the acts of the royal sovereignty, as it is styled by M. de Serres; from this it would follow, by a necessary consequence, which borders on the ridiculous, that the responsibility, attached to the signature of the acts of the Monarch, would fall upon the people, and that what was instituted for their benefit, would turn to their disadvantage: this is what is vulgarly called, the world upside down.

Let me be permitted to observe in this place:

1st. That such language would never have been held in England.

2nd. That it is astonishing it should have passed unnoticed:

3rd. That these words were not spoken by accident, but that they have a manifest tendency and end, which renders their examination the more necessary.

4th. That it results from this doctrine, that the people possess no right whatever, as, according to these words, the chambers, one of which is composed of its representatives, are only associated with the *royal sovereignty, especially in some cases,* for the mere purpose of *aggrandizing this sovereignty, which is alien to it, and of insuring or facilitating the execution of its acts.* It is evident, that this meaning is attached to the words *form of the king's government,* which are found in the preamble of the second paragraph of the charter; from which this consequence might be deduced, that the definition of *sovereignty,* and the partition of the power of a nation, should be taken from the head of a chapter; this is certainly the first time such has been the case, and it requires some explanation.

5th. That there is an evident understanding between the domestic and the foreign doctrines.

6th. That this similarity is established by the systems proceeded upon on both sides, in the formation of the representative assemblies, and which the Laybach document maintains, could not conveniently be effected, but by the assembling all the corporations; insulting and repeating the insults, addressed to France on the method of representation, adopted in this country.* Some French writers, as well

* The Laybach document declares, that this method of representation results from a mean and pitiful method of reasoning, and praises the German representations, which are formed by the assembling the representations of corporations, much above those of France, which it calls the *overpowering tyranny of figures.* The French writers of one party, adopt this doctrine. *The Journal des Debats, of the 19th Nov. 1820, says distinctly, that the two elements of every durable Monarchy, were, the aristocracy and the clergy, and that they only, are the natural support of the throne.*

The Moniteur of the 19th Oct. 1821, says: The Revolution of France, was in fact a usurpation, which began on the very day, when, traitors to the orders of the State which they represented, and violently arrogating to themselves powers which they did not possess, the States General usurped the legislative and sovereign power, of which the King Louis XVIth in his generous and warm solicitude for the welfare of his subjects, was desirous of regulating the performance with their assistance. And the Moniteur of the 6th Oct.

as some newspapers, have propagated these two doctrines. The coincidence of these two tendencies is worthy of remark, for it assists us in

1821, again says: *To speak seriously, it is wished, that the deputies of the Chamber should be united by doctrines; but one condition exists, a condition* sine qua non; *viz. in order to express the real doctrines of the state in our elective chamber, it is necessary, that the real interests of society should be represented in the electoral body and brought into the elective chamber, by the elections. Are we arrived at this state? The political society, in a well constituted state, is the collection of several particular societies or associations of similar interests. In France, the political society is, as yet but an aggregate number of individuals, paying taxes and amongst whom there are some who elect deputies. This is perfectly clear and quite as much so as any thing* for which we are indebted to Germany.

In the ministerial documents, which, by means of the newspapers, were published after the order of the 5th Sep, are to be found the qualifications of supreme legislator, and that, when a law respecting the registering, was to be made with the concurrence of the Chambers.

The same expressions are to be found in M. de Bonald's speech to the Electoral College of Aveyron? It is for you, gentlemen, to complete the work of the supreme legislator; the King, by the fundamental law which he has granted to us, has consented to associate the people in *his high prerogative and to deprive himself, in its favour, of part of his legislative power.*

This clearly shews, that all these doctrines are alike and tend to the same principle, *that the people have no legislative right whatever.*

There are still some men, who look upon the Chambers as councils, and others, who are desirous of bringing us back to the bills of complaints and grievances.

following up the secret action which undermines us; I have shewn it in my work on the law of elections and in this circumstance, I find it again actively engaged. See the Journal de Paris and all that has been published on this head.

This examination approaches its conclusion; —I shall finish it, as it was begun, in the sole hope of rendering it profitable, and, with this view, I will venture thus to address myself to those statesmen, whose actions I have endeavoured to analize. You, who preside over associations of mankind, should extend your views, and proportion them to the grandeur of the origin and of the destinies of these same associations: hitherto you have too much contracted the circle of your ideas; do not judge of these associations according to accidental circumstances, but with an attentive eye to their real nature; not according to the interests of the few, but to those of the whole; not, for the sake of some trifling satisfaction, but for the lasting benedictions and applauses that will resound at the mention of your names in future ages. Lay aside your accusations against an impulse, which draws you, as well as the rest of the world, along with it, which is not that of a few, whom you may injure, but of the uni-

verse, which nothing can counteract;—it would be accusing human nature itself,—it would be accusing civilisation, that repairer of the degradation into which mankind had been plunged by so many ages of barbarism. It is that which surrounds you on every side, which enters into all your longings for power, for enjoyments, for honors. If you pretend to circumscribe it, to arrest its progress, come and I will lead you towards it; banish it from your territory, shut your ports against it, cut off all communication with the universe, and, still more, raise up a party wall in the deep ocean between America and yourselves, stop all your travellers, repel all those of foreign countries, discourage the arts, cause printing to be forgotten; like new Omars, burn all the libraries, and yet, if you cannot deprive man of the faculty of memory, you will have effected nothing; in this desert of annihilation, you may perhaps be permitted to escape from the universal sovereignty of civilisation, but without this absolute sequestration, you will weary yourselves, you will wear yourselves out in an unequal contest, and for what? To defer for a day the reception of its yoke, for it is inevitable, and its weight will depend on your own willingness or on the resistance you make to bow beneath it. I know that this new destiny afflicts and distresses you; it is difficult

to pass from the undivided possession of power, to the partition of it, from absolute government to responsibility; but the state of the world is in question, as also to know whether it will submit to any thing else. The King of Great Britain is neither deprived of power nor of personal enjoyments; the constitutional state has not broken the trident in his hands; it has not dried up his treasures, which have so frequently been your resource; it has not shortened his arms, with which he encircles the two worlds. You may in vain declare, that three times you have combated and arrested revolution; it is not to be ranked amongst those things which are to be arrested, for, even since you have spoken, it has been making rapid strides. Above all, be mindful not to tell mankind that you are responsible before God only; it would be shewing them all human societies deprived of a single guarantee. Responsibility is the guarantee which past ages have sought for in vain; Egypt placed it in the pages of history, which were daily read to her kings; Crete, in the assemblies of her sages; the *Justicia of Arragon*, the *Sinon non*, the *insurrectional right of the Hungarians*, were only the responsibilities of unpolished men, who substituted ridiculous violence for the natural and fixed order of real responsibility. Kings have sometimes sacrificed to its

shadow by the severe punishments they have inflicted on their ministers; lastly, the grand problem, the solution of which has escaped all former ages, is now resolved, and the honour of the solution belongs to our days. More fortunate than our predecessors, we have at length discovered the beneficent concord of the inviolability of the throne and the security of the people; the responsibility of its agents forms the tie which is as favorable to the interest of the one as it is to that of the other; responsibility is to social order that which attraction is to the system of the universe; by it, all attract and adhere to each other, without danger of hurt or injury. Earthly things should be guaranteed on earth; the power which grants the jurisdiction must not be removed; responsibility to Heaven escapes the sight; it is long looked for, and, in this worship, where a single moment is sufficient to unlock the treasures of heaven by mercy, it may be entirely illusory. Perhaps you may congratulate yourselves on the peace you pretend to have restored to the Italian Peninsula; the dispositions which are evinced in presence of an army may be feigned; it is not on the day of terror, but on the day following, that we can clearly read the heart of man; a people can dissemble as well as individuals; Italy is the country of dissimulation;

Nations exist longer than for a day, and nothing can be considered as changed amongst them, if their internal dispositions be not. It is not astonishing that the petty princes of Italy adhere to your resolution; under the shadow of your arms, they continue to enjoy their absolute power. What does Europe care for those Gentlemen, armed with a crown, from whom she has never received any benefit? Of what use to her are those atoms of sovereignty, who will never be of any weight, when it will be necessary to support the balance, which the colossal powers, who are forming themselves in other parts, are drawing towards them? How much are not these pleasures alloyed by the loss which is sustained at the same time by mankind, Europe, Naples, and Italy? Mankind rejoiced over the insurrection of one of its members, which had too long been struck by a moral and social paralysis; Europe rejoiced at the acquisition of a strong reinforcement in a people, which a manly government was about to add to its powers, already too few in number, and too small in comparison with some of them; Italy was gratified by the return to the manly toga, instead of the monkish garb under which she had disappeared from among the nations of the earth; Naples stepped forth from the government which had annihilated her; results, very

different from those which till then had proceeded from privy councils, would have emanated from the great council of the nation united around the throne. A revolution effected by the soldiers, has been stopped in its career, say you; for him, who wishes that no other arms should be made use of among men, than those of reason, and who says with the poet,

Nec sat rationis in armis.

There is little difference between revolutions caused or stopped by soldiers; and to all these causes for regret, there is another to be added, which must be apparent to every friend of justice—the inequality of treatment in precisely similar cases, and the difference between Spain, passed over in silence, and Naples, under the dominion of the sword.

War of Naples.

To see a whole people hastening to the defence of its liberty, and shutting the gates of its country against the invasion of foreigners, is certainly a magnificent spectacle; but that it may be preserved in all its glory, it should be consistent. The sword once drawn, the scabbard should be thrown away. If they had

fought as well at Naples as they have talked, the children of Greece would not, in our days, have been behindhand with their ancestors. Athens and her Tribune, Thermopylæ and Leonidas, would again have been witnessed. Nothing would have been wanting to their glory. But we are not to invoke these illustrious shades, and then finish with a mere harlequinade; nor shew in the legions, assembled for the most noble of all causes, nothing but an army of *Scapins;* for then is compromised the honour of mankind, that of all societies in their most solemn rights, as well as that of the most binding of all engagements. The most beautiful cause, the cause of liberty, is exposed to the insults of her enemies. She is put in the pillory, in the presence of force and arbitrary power. All this operates a multitude of evils on all the world. This consideration has induced me to investigate the cause of this catastrophe, and to put this question to myself, Whence does this inveterate evil of panic fear arise, which seizes the Neapolitans, as it were of its own peculiar right, whenever they appear in face of the enemy?

This is the third time, within twenty-two years, that this people has shewn the same

want of heart. Are the Neapolitans the Indians of Europe? In December 1799, forty-eight thousand Neapolitans, perfectly well-disciplined, equipped, and commanded, fled before a few squadrons of French troops, and abandoned to them the road to Naples. The King, finding himself deserted, fled to Sicily. Gen. Mack dragged, rather than called to Naples; and yielding to the evil destiny that appears to have pursued him, is obliged to seek shelter among his enemies, from the blows of his own soldiers, misled by their own fear, the mother of a thousand idle tales, such as are to be found amongst a mob of cowardly and flying soldiers. A few French officers, commanding some small corps, were alone sufficient to keep them in better order.

In 1815, the army of Joachim only stood one battle. The following day, a total defeat dragged him back to Naples, the port of safety for all these military wrecks.

In 1821, the same scene is repeated. Positions which, with any other troops, would have been impregnable, were abandoned, without a single blow being struck; places were deserted, from which the enemy might have been annihilated; and the General, who had

the misfortune to link his fate to that of this easily-frightened troop, left them, venting upon them his curses, and every epithet which contempt could imagine most insulting.

One single corps, formed in the French school, stood its ground, and preserved its colours and its honour.

What can all this mean? Who is it that forms these nimble-footed armies? Who are these men, born subjects of fear, who dare not look in the face of an enemy under arms? Are they not the children of Greece? Were they not Brutians and Samnites? Did they not cost Rome ages of labour? What is it they are wanting in? Are they not robust? are they not endowed with passions? and with these, is not one man always as good as another? And yet the high road to their capital is open to whomsoever chooses to venture upon it, and if they do shew themselves, it is only to mark it out by the traces of their footsteps. Once more, whence does this arise? Have treason, seduction, underhand practices, been at their usual work? Have those, who ought to have given an example of firmness, paved the way for defection and for flight? Have the principal

Commanders been wanting in their duty, and to their reputation? Did all these soldiers serve against their will? and did their hearts accord with their arms? But let us look beyond all this. These are but deceitful appearances, a bark that conceals the real evil. Its roots lie deep, for they are to be found in the history of the people; that alone explains every thing, and is quite sufficient for that purpose. Having passed from hand to hand, like a wretched piece of furniture lent upon hire, a stranger to all great political interest, to war, to commerce, to colonial organization, having to do only with heaven and with the earth, and finding them constantly propitious; this nation has seen its manly qualities dwindle away, for want of employment, and by means of its political nullity. What use would it have made of it, in its state of separation from other nations? It has turned its faculties, which were otherwise useless, towards the enjoyments of effeminate luxury. The Palace and the Court have, for want of a Cabinet, become temples consecrated to the arts, the amusements of leisure hours. Activity has been divided between the churches and the theatres. What can you expect from men decomposed by the continual action of such dissolvents? Superstition brutifies him,

idleness enervates him, the vices of luxury and effeminacy relax the springs of the minds of the great, and, by a natural consequence, of the people also, who are always servile imitators of their rulers. When the hour of danger approaches, no one is to be found. Having established convents, and favoured the manners of convents, you have no longer but an army of monks.

But who is to blame, the people? Assuredly not. The fault lies entirely with their masters. The people are precisely what they have made them. Do we then find men differently made to what they have been? When Frederick, and the great Czar wanted to form their people, what institutions did they present to them? Was it in approximating them to Lacedemonia, or to Notre Dame de Lorette, and the Circus of Naples, that they drew from their bosoms those valiant armies, which laid the foundation of their glory and their power? Lazzaroni and singers are not fit instruments to form the bulwarks of a State.

When a people has been languishing in this state of subjection, it requires much time to eradicate the leprosy of the vices which prey upon it, which infect the mass of its blood, and

corrode all its nerves. It would require another Peter the Great to work upon it, as aquafortis does on iron, as was well expressed by the great Frederick; for great men never fail in drawing the portraits of their equals. After having submitted it to this ordeal, you can then lead it to battle; but to send forth men from the gates of convents, or from the foot of the altar of St. Januarius, who can only cry when Vesuvius threatens to vomit the fire of its bowels upon them, is but to consign them to certain defeat and slaughter. How will they dare to attack those iron-hearted battalions, those living volcanoes, who, in a regular action, deal out fire and death? This would be seeking the deplorable scenes, of which we have been witnesses.

And what pitiful Court did not the Josephs, the Joachims, and all their predecessors, who kept the people in their base superstitions, pay to this people, as if to conciliate a favour that might be of assistance, whilst they could not hope for any support, but in the banishing for ever of these objects, as the only means of purifying minds which had been too long fascinated? What could they expect from the public homage, which they rendered to that which they secretly laughed at? And what

has been their reward? Popular dissimulation has never strengthened a State.

The destruction of Naples was prepared by the fatal parcelling out of Italy, which, in multiplying the powers, have left her without strength. What reason had not Italy to wish for a reunion of all her members! She would not have been in her present situation, if Napoleon, instead of dividing this great body into three discordant and inimical portions, had worked according to the model formed by nature, by reuniting it into one single political association, under a ruler and an administration worthy of her. He had it in his power, the vows of all Italy were in favor of it, Europe would have applauded it. Patriotic sentiments, that sublime source of the greatest actions, would then have penetrated into bosoms which are now callous to them; they would have blossomed; they would have taken root in this country; she would have emulated the virtues of her ancient citizens. Strong in herself by the reunion of all her members, Italy would have sufficed for her own defence;—too strong to be conquered, and yet not strong enough to conquer others, favorable to the independence of others, as much as to her own, she offered to

Europe at the same time a pacific and a tutelary guarantee: her loss will be long felt in Europe.

This error was one of the greatest aberrations of Napoleon's policy; it may have been the cause of his downfal; the part of Romulus was offered to him, why did he not accept it? May Italy, in mourning weeds, not trouble the peace of his grave!

The inequality between the power of Austria and the nullity of Naples, was too great for the results of the war to be favourable to the latter —Austria bears upon Italy with the whole weight of her empire; she is upon its borders, and has formed an establishment against the Italian states, not to be shook. She is backed by the Alps and the sea; she is covered by the Po, the Tesino, the Adda, the Mincio, the great lakes of the Alps, the Adige, the Tagliamento, the Izonzi.—She occupies Pavia, Pizzigithone, Mantua, Peschiera, the citadel of Ferrara, Venice, Palma Nova, and Codroipo. There is not a State which has a frontier so well defended, and it is singular, that Austria, who is perfectly open on the side towards the stronger powers, viz. Russia and Prussia, is perfectly

well guarded on the weaker side, viz. towards Piedmont, the Pope, and Naples. France is far off, and what has she ever to do on her own account in Italy?—When, therefore, an Austrian army is seen on the Po, the Austrians may be considered as being at Naples. . . . . It was gallant to close up the road, that is, to dispute it; but to stop them effectually was impossible.

Actual State of Naples.

This country has, as it were, disappeared; the channels, by which we might receive intelligence, are obstructed by interested hands; the accounts drawn up by them speak no more to our minds, than to our confidence; some facts only may appear certain on the state of this country, over which absolute power has spread its accustomed veil, by covering it with its net.

In the first place, it appears that a frightful system of robbery again devastates this country; this, accompanied by superstition, is its greatest evil. The revolution was intended to extinguish both, the counter-revolution will increase and strengthen them.

The King, at the time of his departure, had addressed the following act,* which contained

* Message from the King of Naples to the Parliament, communicating the invitation he had received to proceed to Laybach.

"Ferdinand Ist, by the grace of God, and by the Constitution of the monarchy, King of the two Sicilies, to my faithful Deputies, in Parliament assembled:

"The Sovereigns of Austria, Prussia, and Russia, assembled in Congress at Troppau, have addressed three letters to me, by which I am requested to proceed in person to Laybach, in order that I may form part of the new Congress, which will be held in the last-mentioned city.

"According to these letters, which I have desired my Minister for Foreign Affairs to communicate to you, you will feel the importance of the object of this invitation, which is to interpose myself as a mediator between the said Sovereigns and the nation.

"Deeply penetrated with this force of circumstances, and anxious not to neglect any sacrifice, for the solid establishment of the welfare of the nation, I accept all expedients which present the hope of succeeding in that object. I have, therefore, resolved to conquer all the difficulties which my advanced age, and the rigour of the season, oppose to me, in order to comply, as speedily as possible, with the invitation which has been transmitted to me; the Sovereigns having notified to me, that they would not treat with any other person, not even with the Princes of my royal blood. I depart in the confidence that Divine Providence will provide me with the means of giving you a last proof of my affection, by averting the scourge which war would bring upon the nation.

"Far be from me, and from yourselves, the idea, that my acceptance of this proposition will, for an instant, induce me to disregard the welfare of my people! On separating myself from you, it is worthy of you and of myself, that

all the principles of a charter, to the parliament.

He has restricted the institutions to the form-

I should give you a new and solemn guarantee. I, therefore, declare to you and to the nation, that I will do every thing that lies within my power, to secure a wise and liberal Constitution to my subjects. Whatever measure circumstances may render necessary, with respect to our political situation, I will use my utmost endeavours to establish this State upon the following bases:—

"1st. That the real and individual liberty of my well-beloved subjects be secured, by a fundamental law of the State.

"2d. That no respect be paid to the privileges of birth, in the composition of the State.

"3d. That no impost be levied without the consent of the nation, by their legitimate representatives.

"4th. That the statement of the public expenditure be laid before the nation and its representatives.

"5th. That the laws be framed in unison with the national representatives.

"6th. That the judicial power be independent.

"7th. That the liberty of the press be preserved, subject only to the laws, for the punishment of the abuse thereof.

"8th. That the Ministers be responsible.

"9th. That the Civil List be regulated.

"And I further declare, that I will never consent that any of my subjects be molested for any political act.

"In taking this charge upon myself, my faithful Deputies, to convince you of my love, and of my solicitude for the welfare of the nation, I desire that a deputation of four members, to be chosen by the Parliament, may accompany me, in order that they may witness the dangers which await us, and the efforts that will be made to avoid them.

ation of a Council of State, and of Provincial Assemblies.*

He had declared by the same Act, that he would never suffer any of his subjects to be molested for any political act.

Generals, deputies, have been banished, imprisoned in Austria, a price has been set on heads; general accusations, numberless forfeitures have taken place; the army has been disbanded; the Jesuits have been re-established, and missions have been commended. This is about the extent of the information we have

Moniteur, 14*th June*, 1821.
Council of State, Naples, 26*th May*, 1821.

* Two provincial assemblies are established; one for the States on the Continent, the other for Sicily.

The first to be composed of thirty members.

The second of eighteen.

A Council of State shall be established in Naples, and another in Sicily.

The Provincial Assemblies will be required to give their advice upon the projects of law submitted to the Council of State, upon the Budget, and upon the reduction of the public Debt.

Each Province will have a Council, which will be required to partition the provincial contingent among the Communes; its members will be chosen by the King from amongst the principal proprietors.

The laws will be issued with the following formula:

The King, by the advice of his Council, commands, &c.

been able to procure as certain; respecting the state of the kingdom of Naples.

But here, a very natural reflection presents itself:

This is the third time within twenty-two years, that the King of Naples has recovered his power by the hands of foreigners; he is absolute master, he possesses the whole power; but where is his force? What could he effect for Europe? for himself? Where are his troops? If even he had any, what could he do with them, after what has occurred? His power is therefore confined to personal enjoyment, it has nothing in common with real strength; he commands the law at home, but he may be obliged to accept it from all the world. In this state of things, it is natural to ask, What has he gained? Would not a system of a regenerating nature for his people, have invested him with more real power? Might not the King of the two Sicilies, with seven or eight millions of subjects, have been of great weight in the balance of Europe? Frederic had not half the number when he repulsed the three great continental powers, which were in coalition against him, and which were also assisted by Sweden and the German empire.

On a still closer examination, I cannot discover what this prince has gained; but, on the contrary, I perceive very distinctly what has been lost by his own country, by Italy, by Europe, by Austria herself, who has had the imprudence to draw Russia into the affairs of the South of Europe; and, above all, by France, who, excluded as she is from all alliance in the north and centre of Germany, can only form a federative system in the South of Europe with the princes of her blood, and with States governed in the same manner as herself:—this we have demonstrated, and will again demonstrate.

MONITEUR, 14th March, 1821.

Declaration of Troppau, 14th December, 1820.

The allied Sovereigns herein declare that the events of the 8th of March, in Spain, of the 2nd of July, at Naples, and those which have taken place in Portugal, impose the necessity upon them, of concerting such measures as may prevent the calamities which threaten Europe. This is the third time that the revolutionary spirit has shewn itself, and for the third time they will combat it.

As they have delivered the European Continent from the military oppression of the

representative of the Revolution, so they will put an end to the no less frightful, and no less tyrannical usurpation of rebellion and fury; the meeting at Troppau has no other motive, no other view.

The Powers exercised an undoubted right, in considering of joint measures of precaution against States, in which an overthrow of the Government, effected by rebellion, even considered only as an example, must give occasion to a hostile attitude towards all legitimate constitutions and governments. The exercise of this right, became the more urgent, when those who came into this situation endeavoured to communicate the misfortune, which they had drawn on themselves, to the neighbouring countries, and to spread around them rebellion and confusion.

As the revolution at Naples daily takes more root; as no others, so nearly and so evidently, endanger the tranquillity of the neighbouring States, and as no other can be so immediately and speedily opposed, a conviction arose of the necessity of proceeding towards the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, according to the principles above stated.

In order to lead to conciliatory measures for this purpose, the Monarchs assembled at Troppau, resolved to invite the King of the Two Sicilies to an interview at Laybach; a step, the sole object of which was, to free the will of the King from all external constraint, and to place his Majesty in the situation of a mediator between his misled people and the States whose tranquillity was threatened.

France and England have been invited to participate in this step, and it is to be expected that they will not refuse their concurrence, as the principles on which the invitation is founded, is perfectly conformable to the treaties they have formerly signed; and besides, offers a pledge of the most just and peaceable sentiments.

The system adopted between Austria, Russia, and Prussia, is not a new one; it reposes on the same maxims which were the basis of the treaties by which the union of the European States was founded.

No other proof is necessary, that neither thoughts of conquest, nor the intention of violating the independence of other governments

in their internal administration, nor the endeavour to impede voluntary and wise ameliorations, consonant with the true interests of nations, has had any share in the resolution of the Allied Powers. They desire nothing but to maintain peace, to free Europe from the scourge of revolution, and to prevent, or to lessen, as far as in their power, the evil which arises from the violation of all principles of order and morality.

MONITEUR, 6th February, 1821.

Lord Castlereagh's Circular Dispatch, in answer to the Declaration of Troppau.

After several preliminary articles, which are foreign to the present subject, the minister continues:

These measures embraced two distinct objects: 1st, The establishment of certain general principles for the regulation of the future political conduct of the Allies in the cases therein described: 2ndly, The proposed mode of dealing, under these principles, with the existing affairs of Naples.

The system of measures, proposed under the

former head, if to be reciprocally acted upon, would be in direct repugnance to the fundamental laws of this country. But even if this decisive objection did not exist, the British Government would nevertheless regard the principles on which these measures rest, to be such as could not be safely admitted as a system of international law. They are of opinion, that their adoption would inevitably sanction, and in the hands of less beneficent monarchs, might hereafter lead to a much more frequent and extensive interference in the internal transactions of states, than they are persuaded is intended by the august parties from whom they proceed, or can be reconcileable either with the general interest, or with the efficient authority and dignity of independent sovereigns. They do not regard the alliance as entitled, under existing treaties, to assume, in their character as allies, any such general powers, nor do they conceive, that such extraordinary powers could be assumed, in virtue of any fresh diplomatic transaction among the allied courts, without either attributing to themselves a supremacy incompatible with the rights of other States, or if to be acquired through the special accession of such States, without introducing a federative system in Europe, not only

unwieldy and ineffectual to its object, but leading to many most serious inconveniences.

With respect to the particular case of Naples, the British Government, at the very earliest moment, did not hesitate to express their strong disapprobation of the mode and circumstances under which that revolution was understood to have been effected; but they, at the same time, expressly declared to the several Allied Courts, that they should not consider themselves as either called upon or justified, to advise an interference on the part of this country; they fully admitted, however, that other European states, and especially Austria and the Italian powers, might feel themselves differently circumstanced; and they professed that it was not their purpose to prejudge the question as it might affect them, or to interfere with the course which such States might think fit to adopt, with a view to their own security, provided only that they were ready to give every reasonable assurance, that their views were not directed to purposes of aggrandizement, subversive of the territorial system of Europe, as established by the late treaties.

Upon these principles, the conduct of his Majesty's government with regard to the Neu-

politan question has been, from the first moment, uniformly regulated, and copies of the successive instructions, sent to the British authorities at Naples for their guidance, have been, from time to time, transmitted for the information of the Allied Governments.

With regard to the expectation which is expressed in the circular above alluded to, of the assent of the courts of London and Paris to the more general measures proposed for their adoption, founded, as it is alleged, upon existing treaties: in justification of its own consistency and good faith, the British Government, in withholding such assent, must protest against any such interpretation being put upon the treaties in question, as is therein assumed.

They have never understood these treaties to impose any such obligations; and they have, on various occasions, both in parliament and in their intercourse with the Allied Governments, distinctly maintained the negative of such a proposition. That they have acted with all possible explicitness upon this subject, would at once appear from reference to the deliberations at Paris, in 1815, previons to the conclusion of the treaty of alliance at Aix-la-Chapelle, in 1818, and subsequently in certain

discussions which took place in the course of the last year.

After having removed the misconception to which the passage of the circular in question, if passed over in silence, might give countenance: and having stated in general terms, without however entering into the argument, the dissent of his Majesty's government from the general principle upon which the circular in question is founded, it should be clearly understood that no government can be more prepared, than the British Government is, to uphold the right of any State or States to interfere, where their own immediate security or essential interests are seriously endangered by the internal transactions of another state. But as they regard the assumption of such right, as only to be justified by the strongest necessity and to be limited and regulated thereby, they cannot admit that this right can receive a general and indiscriminate application to all revolutionary movements without reference to their immediate bearing upon some particular State or States or be made prospectively the basis of an alliance. They regard its exercise as an exception to general principles, of the greatest value and importance, and as one that only properly grows out of the circumstances of the

special case: but they at the same time consider, that exceptions of this description never can, without the utmost danger, be so far reduced to rule, as to be incorporated into the ordinary diplomacy of States or into the institutes of the law of nations.

MONITEUR, 27th May, 1821.

Laybach, 12th May, 1821.

The Congress of the Allied Sovereigns, and of their Cabinets at Troppau, determined upon, in consequence of the events, by which the legitimate government at Naples, had been overthrown, was destined to fix the point of view it would be necessary to assume with respect to these disastrous circumstances, to concert a general line of conduct, and to combine, in a spirit of justice, moderation and preservation, such measures as might be thought proper, to protect Italy from a general overthrow, and the neighbouring States from the most imminent danger. Thanks to the happy conformity of views and of dispositions, which the three august sovereigns entertained, the first task was speedily accomplished. Principles clearly expressed, and embraced reciprocally with all the sincerity of internal

conviction, led to analagous resolutions, and the bases established at the first conference, have been invariably followed throughout the whole course of a meeting, attended by the most remarkable results.

Being transferred to Laybach, this meeting assumed a character more clearly developed in consequence of the presence and the concurrence of the King of the Two Sicilies, and by the unanimous assent, with which the Italian Princes acceded to the system adopted by the allied cabinets. The Sovereigns were convinced that the governments the most directly interested in the destinies of the Peninsula, would do justice to the purity of their intentions, and that a Sovereign placed in the most embarrassing situation, by acts, with which perfidy and violence had succeeded in associating his name, would rely with perfect confidence on the measures, which would put an end to his moral captivity, and at the same time, restore to his faithful subjects that peace and well being, of which they have been deprived by criminal factions.

The effect of these measures was not long in shewing itself. The edifice, raised by revolt, whose superstructure was as fragile as its base

was vicious, supported only by the craftiness of some, and the temporary blindness of others, rejected by the immense majority of the nation, and odious even to the army raised in its defence, crumbled into dust the first moment it came in contact with the regular force, destined for its overthrow, and which only served to expose the sandiness of its foundation. The legitimate power is re-established, faction is dispersed; the Neapolitan people is delivered from those audacious impostors, who, whilst they amused it with the phantom of imagined liberty, exercised the most cruel vexations, imposed the most enormous sacrifices, for the sole profit of their ambition and avidity, and were advancing with rapid strides towards the irreparable ruin of a country, of which they did not cease to style themselves the regenerators.

This important restoration has been effected (as far as it could and ought to be done) by the counsels and exertions of the allied powers. Now that the King of the two Sicilies is again invested with the plenitude of his power, the sovereigns restrict themselves to the expression of their most ardent wishes for the happy execution of those resolutions which this sovereign will adopt for the reconstruction of his government on solid foundations, and to insure, by

wise laws and institutions, the real interests of his subjects, and the constant prosperity of his kingdom.

During the course of these important transactions, we have seen the effects of this vast conspiracy burst forth in various parts;—it has been plotting for a long time against all established power, and against those rights, consecrated by that social order, under which Europe has for so many ages enjoyed happiness and glory. The existence of this conspiracy was not unknown to the sovereigns, but amidst the agitations which Italy has experienced since the catastrophe of the year 1820, and the agitation which thence communicated itself to all minds, it has been developing itself with increasing rapidity, and has at last shewn its real character. It is not, as may have been supposed at some less advanced period, it is not against this or that form of government, which may be the particular object of their declamations, that the gloomy enterprizes of the authors of these intrigues, and the ridiculous wishes of their infatuated partisans, are directed. States, which have admitted changes into their political systems, are not more secure from their attacks than are those whose ancient institutions have withstood the troubles of the times;—pure

and limited monarchies, federative Constitutions, republics, all are comprised, all are encircled in the orders of proscription of a sect which treats as oligarchical, every thing, under whatsoever form it may be, that raises itself beyond the level of a chimerical equality. The chiefs of this impious league, equally indifferent to what may be the result of the general destruction which they meditate, and to every species of stable and permanent organization, wish only to sap the fundamental basis of society. To overthrow every thing that exists, and to be ready to replace it by whatever accident may suggest to their disordered imaginations, or to their perverse passions, such is the essence of their doctrines, and the secret of all their machinations.

The allied sovereigns could not otherwise than perceive, that there existed only one barrier which could be opposed to this devastating torrent. The invariable principle of their policy, the point to set out from, and the final object of all their resolutions, could only be to preserve that which is legally established. They could not be impeded by the vain clamours of the ignorant, who accused them of condemning mankind to a state of stagnation and torpor, incompatible with the natural and continued pro-

gress of affairs, and with the perfection of social institutions. The sovereigns have never manifested the least disposition to oppose any real improvement, or the reform of abuses which may creep in under the best of governments. They have ever been animated by very different views, and if the tranquillity, which both the governments and the people had a right to suppose insured by the peace of Europe, has not been able to effect all the good which ought to have resulted from it, it is because the governments have been obliged to turn all their thoughts to the means of opposing the progress of a faction, which, spreading error, discontent, and the fanaticism of innovation around them, would have reduced the existence of any public system whatever to a mere problem. The useful and necessary changes in the legislation and administration of a State, ought only to emanate from the free will, the deliberate and enlightened impulse of those whom God has rendered responsible for power. Every thing which deviates from this line, leads necessarily to disorder and overthrow, to evils more insufferable than those which it is pretended to heal. Penetrated with this eternal truth, the sovereigns have not hesitated to proclaim it with candour and firmness; they have declared that, at the same time that they respect the rights

and independence of every legitimate power, they look upon all pretended reform effected by revolt and open force, as legally null and disavowed by the principles which constitute the public rights of Europe.—In consequence of this declaration, they have taken part in the events of Naples, of Piedmont, and in those which, under very different circumstances, but, by equally criminal combinations, have just rendered the eastern part of Europe the scene of incalculable convulsions.

MONITEUR, 30th January, 1821.

AUGSBURG.

Document of Laybach, published in the Gazette Universelle.

That violent fermentation of the mind which, during the French Revolution, manifested itself by so terrible an explosion of popular phrenzy, became a complete and thorough revolution, which has since introduced so many evils in these our days, and which seem to commence a new era. The three military revolutions of last year have determined the Sovereigns, preservers of the peace of Europe, to seek, in common, those salutary measures necessary to be adopted, in order to overcome

and give a direction to this formidable agitation, so as to prevent a general overthrow, and to lay the foundation of a better state of things in the centre of disorder.

The monarchical principles, the object of which is to maintain the authority of the law in all parts of the State, by means of a solid and durable order of things, are in opposition to those theories and systems which tend to the foundation of governments on the sovereignty of every individual; and which, appearing to transform the greatest monarchies into democratical republics, with a monarchical form of administration, actually strip the Government of every basis which experience has invested it with, make it pass, by force of sophistry or of arms, from one party to the other, and precipitate States into an eternal agitation, into lawless and endless vicissitudes.

In this great struggle, and these continual reactions, it is imperiously necessary to discover and renovate those institutions, which present monarchy in all its purity and useful influence, for the purpose of developing and gradually bringing them to perfection, so that it may fulfil, as much as possible, the wishes of faithful and well-meaning subjects. These

institutions, although entirely different in their foundation and their end; to those fanciful productions of the opposite doctrine of independence, are, in return, of such a nature, as completely to satisfy those who are only attached to these from errors, without their hearts being as yet perverted. From hence arise the importance and necessity, which become every day more indispensable, to determine the nature of the Constitution of a State in the most particular manner, and to distinguish those forms which are really monarchical, from those which are purely democratical, and are, therefore, inadmissible in a monarchy.

Without wishing to pronounce a premature judgment on this great question, we have, at least, the right of comparing, in this respect, the different Constitutions which have been formed in our days, and we think ourselves permitted to place that of Germany on a parallel with two extreme terms of comparison, the French Constitution of 1791, and the Spanish Constitution of 1812. The Constitutions of Bavaria, Wurtemberg, Baden, and of Darmstadt, begin with this important declaration: the Sovereign reunites all the parts of the sovereign authority. The federal

Act adds, the Sovereign, according to a representative Constitution, or a Constitution of Estates, cannot require the co-operation of the Estates, excepting in the exercise of certain determined rights. Thus, according to these Constitutions, the first authority in the State, viz. the sovereignty, resides in the Monarch, and cannot, in any manner, be shaken or displaced by the rights of the Estates, in any thing relating to legislation, or to the acquiescence in the imposition of taxes. The Constitution merely decrees the necessary legal forms to be used in certain cases, in order to validate the will of the Sovereign. The constitutional co-operation of the Estates is the legal condition on which, in the cases specified, the validity of the monarchical will depends.

In opposition to this principle, the French Revolution of 1791, and the new Constitution of Spain, have created a sovereign assembly, in which they have concentrated into one point the seat of the Sovereign and dictatorial will of the people, which, in its turn, should be attached, in the strongest manner, to the first Magistrate.

Besides, according to the German Consti-

tutions, the different Estates of the social order form, as such, a part of the national representation. The Deputies cannot, indeed, be bound in their votes by any special mandate; but the right of election is grounded on a particular qualification, which renders a person eligible to a seat in the States, or upon established laws, relative to Corporations. Thus the Chambers are composed, 1st, of the heads of the most ancient, most distinguished, and most opulent families, who are considered, with regard to the State, as possessing an existence peculiar to them, and forming, as it were, small States in subordinate Corporations: 2d, of deputies of the nobility, inferior in rank and fortune, and who (especially in Wirtemberg) form Corporations according to districts, which are united together by a species of federal bond; 3d, of Heads of Catholic and Protestant Churches; the representatives of Universities are also members of the Chambers; 4th, of the principal and the most independent cities, which have a special administration and a municipal organization, or those where it is to be established, have the right to select their own Deputies; lastly, the inhabitants of small towns, of boroughs, villages, and of the Low Country, which are united in parishes and communes, possessing a Constitution and

special communal rights, or who, according to the existing laws, may form such a union, have the privilege of appointing a considerable number of Deputies; and the law of elections has provided, that those inhabitants who possess the largest funded property, shall share in the elections, in proportion to their property.

The assembly of the States, thus composed, forms, in a manner, and concentrates on one point, the representation of the different classes and particular Corporations, of their rights and interests, which are supposed, in regard to the State, to be in a manner independent, and that by means of the representation of the private rights of individuals.

And yet the representative power is not sovereign; but in the same degree that every private and particular right stands in a relation of forced obedience towards the sovereign will of the State, so does a reunited representation stand in the necessary relation of fidelity, obedience, and submission to the sovereign power. It limits the exercise of it by legal forms, in the same manner that the sovereign authority is limited, with respect to the private rights

of individuals, by a spirit of independent justice.

In total opposition to these principles, the Constitutions of 1791 and 1812 lay the foundation of representation on the previous annihilation of the different classes, and on the refusal to acknowledge those individual interests which establish all distinctions amongst men, in a word, on a universal equality. The general reason must be considered as the quality or attribute, upon which the right of representation is exclusively founded. Then, supposing that the reason which is here cited, be, according to the expression of a certain writer, a mean and pitiful manner of reasoning, it is the evident result of its estimating it by figures. This calculating species of reason can, therefore, consider the Monarch himself only as its servant, to whom it grants a limited veto, merely from motives of prudence or favour.

It appears to us, that it is within these bases that the most essential differences consist between the Constitutions, which may be admitted as being truly monarchical, and those fictitious ones which ought to be

rejected; We abstain, for the present, from examining those middle systems, accidental modifications, and the ulterior questions relative to these objects. It may, however, be asserted, without hesitation, that the two Constitutions of 1791 and 1812, viz. the first French Constitution and the modern Spanish one, form the antipodes to monarchical ideas; and that, on the contrary, the German Constitutions, although they may not, as yet, have solved the problem of uniting true and vigorous freedom with unity, still they furnish the best models of Constitutions, compatible with the essence of monarchical dignity. There is, therefore, reason to hope, that the sovereign Chiefs will exert themselves more and more to strengthen the bases of social order upon these principles, which have been developed in Germany in the most extended manner, and which have there found the best soil for their cultivation.

Without depreciating, in any manner, the national advantages any other nation may possess, we may entertain the hope, that Germany, who, as heretofore, is again become the fruitful parent of forms and institutions,

by which social intercourse is fixed in a preponderating manner in Europe, will be acknowledged as the greatest school of the most important practical ideas of administration, and that its example and its reflexions will be the objects of deep attention.

CHAP. XV.

SPAIN AND PORTUGAL.

HERE, I see two vessels launched on the high sea of revolution, pursuing their voyage in company, in the midst of contrary winds and storms. Where will their voyage end? This is a question to be decided by the skill of the Pilots. Thus much only can be said at present on the future prospects of these two countries.

Two ages since, the hardy seamen of Spain and Portugal commenced, almost at the same time, their voyages on the discovery of two different worlds, and on an equally successful, although opposite course, gave to Europe and their country, the Indies and America. In the present day, these two countries are at the same time engaged in a still more beneficial enterprize, that of accomplishing their own regeneration and preventing their remaining beneath those, who are partly indebted to their labors for their present possessions. Having,

up to this time, remained spectators of the changes by which part of Europe has been renewed, having supported the weight of them, they have, in their turn, become desirous of procuring these advantages to themselves, and have ardently engaged in a revolution, more perfect than that of any other country.

These two countries are suffering from an evil peculiar to themselves, which no other people can appreciate like them, and the possibility of which did not exist previous to the grand discoveries of the 15th century. This evil arises from their colonial possessions, which are immense. Spain and Portugal are but the heads and very small heads of the gigantic bodies of their American colonies; the Brazils are twenty times the size of Portugal. What is Spain with her twenty two thousand square leagues in comparison with her portion of America, which measures six hundred and seventy thousand? But at the same time that a regeneration of the doctrines of the mother country in Europe is accomplishing; the American colonies, profiting by the occasion, the precepts and the example, are also willing to engage in the same work. Whilst the mother country is occupied in celebrating the charms of liberty, the colonies, on their

side, send forth hymns in honor of this universal liberating Goddess of mankind; and whilst the mother country exposes, reveals, and corrects the too visible deformities of her government, the colonies, also proclaim and clearly demonstrate, which can very easily be done, the inconsistency of the subordination of the immense country of America, to a few petty districts of Europe. Of the dependence of countries so distant, and so different from the mother country in Europe, all that Spain alleges against the absolute power of one man, America brings forward against the absolute rule of Europe over America, against the servitude of the one for the benefit, and by the hands of another; every precaution Spain takes to secure her constitutional prize, America avails herself of, to consolidate her freedom; America is a complete parody of Spain; and indeed, it would be difficult to point out any reasonable answer that could be made, were America to say, I am only doing what you have done, do not be irritated against the work of your own hands.

Thus, in this age, by a second conformity, as fatal for both as the first had been fortunate, Spain and Portugal, see, almost on the same day, the rich conquests, towards which they

simultanously hastened in ages past, ready to escape from their grasp.

We reserve the details of these events for the article which treats upon America.

In all constitutional countries, the resumption of the legislative labors, forms the most important event of the year; the eyes of all citizens, even those of foreigners are turned towards the assembly of the great council of the nation around the throne; the increase of good, the cessation of evil, the strengthening of the springs of state, are expected from it; the attention and wishes are all directed towards this centre. England commences a fresh career with the opening of Parliament; during the hundred and fifty years of her troubles, the dissolution and re-opening of the parliament were the objects of the attention and the desires of the whole of Great Britain.

Spain, by her constitutional laws, enjoys these meetings at fixed and settled periods; this is a great advantage and a real perfection; England is deprived of it. This regularity is in itself a source of great good; for the example given from above, carries with itself a great lesson; every one seeing a Government re-

gular, becomes so himself; what is to be opposed to such a regularity, cannot be conceived. That which is done in one place can be executed in another; why, therefore, cannot the legislative occupations be prepared for a fixed period, and why cannot the legislative parliaments be assembled at a regular time, as well as the legal parliaments used to be?

Spain and Portugal have avoided the inconvenience of these arbitrary summonses;—they have done more, for they have decreed, that a portion of the Cortes, under the title of a permanent commission, should serve as a link between the expiring and approaching session, and that the legislative powers should not, at any time, be entirely suspended; to all these precautions, they have added the right of convoking extraordinary Cortes on any occasion when the public interest may require such a measure. It is impossible to be more prodigal of precaution. The first legislative assembly in Spain was held and dissolved in 1820, according to the constitutional regulations; a permanent commission executed the functions assigned to it by law. A new session was commenced on the 1st March, 1821, and ended the 31st July, having exceeded the term appointed by the Constitution, one month; this

it did in comformity with the power, granted by law, of extending the session a month beyond the usual time. A commission again filled up the *constitutional interim*. An extraordinary Cortes assembled again on the 28th Sept. and are still sitting. Thus has the new machine rolled on in the circle traced out by the Constitution. Some progress is made by not swerving from the regular track; and this regularity, while it imparts an idea of strength, at the same time inspires hope.

The opening of the first assembly produced a change in the ministry, which took place on the 1st March last.

The speech, delivered by the King, was couched in the most noble and patriotic terms. After having taken a summary view of all the objects relative to internal adminstration, and having expressed himself, with respect to foreign interference in the affairs of Naples, with the dignity becoming a chief of an independent nation, and proud of the recent proofs he had received of the manner in which she would defend her independence, he took occasion to notice a want of respect which he had experienced; but this complaint he made rather on behalf of his office than as an individual; he

also animadverted upon some of the constituted authorities, without precisely naming any one.

The reply of the Cortes was similar to those of the same nature; a species of repetition of the speech from the throne, or what is called in England, an *Echo of the King's Speech*. But whether the ministers thought themselves inculpated by the general reproach, pronounced by the King, or whether they looked upon the addition made, without their knowledge, to a speech, which they had prepared, or to which they had at least consented, as a retraction of confidence, they resigned their places, and thus made room for the formation of a new ministry; this is at all times an important affair, and above all, in a constitutional government, agitated by factions, and rendered perilous by responsibility.

During the sitting of the 8th March, the Cortes evinced the most manly disposition with respect to foreign interference and thence took occasion to decree the establishment of national armed force.

The King in his speech, had confirmed the assurance given by the Sovereigns assembled

at Laybach, to abstain from all interference in the affairs of Spain. Patriotic enthusiasm, the fruit of distrust caused by external occurrences, and by internal resistance, carried some members so far as to move, that measures, as severe as banishment, should be taken against some Bishops, who were accused of direct opposition.

These occurrences were followed by disturbances in the city of Madrid: the King had been absent. It appears, that advantage had been taken of his absence to form cabals about his person. There is nothing new in this, although the consequences are fatal; ill-advised courtiers imagine, that they have only to form little intrigues about and under the influence of the prince, and that every thing must succomb to this impulse. They will not perceive, notwithstanding the most fatal experience, that they are only compromising the prince, and raising clouds of awful distrust around him; and, what is still worse, that they are drawing down storms upon the heads of the innocent people; for it is always upon them that every thing definitively falls, and then, when these disorders have destroyed and upset every thing, they turn round, and, in the height of tumult, lay upon revolutions the blame of the consequences of their

own machinations and their foolish and feeble opposition; for, in fact, what success could they reasonably flatter themselves with? This is a consideration which escapes the conspirators of all countries alike, who fancy their own thoughts those of the whole nation, and their private meetings those of the whole people. Nothing else has been seen these thirty years past.

In such a state of things, who can prevail against a generally adopted system in Spain? The curate Merino, a few monks, the life-guards, the king's chaplain—such are the mighty instruments to be put in the balance against a whole nation, and against the public authority, governed by the agents of the new order of things, having the King at their head. Could a more ridiculous or a more criminal hope ever be entertained? And what has been the consequence? The life-guards have been dismissed, and finally disbanded. They have caused the destruction of their corps, have deprived the King of servants to whom he might have attached himself, and of a splendid appendage to his throne; the chaplain has exposed himself to a terrible end, which has, alas! been too speedily realized. The King has been exposed to insults, to which his person should

never have been subjected; and to whom must the cause of all this be attributed? Is it to be attributed to the Revolution which is settled, and only requires strengthening, or to the enemies of this consolidation, to those evil servants, obstinate in their blindness of pride and selfish regret, who compromise their prince under the appearance of zeal, as fatal to him as to themselves and all the world? The fault really belongs to all the *Vive le Roi, quand même,* who chalk out to themselves a plan, diametrically opposite to that which the prince thinks proper to adopt; who pretend to serve him in spite of himself; to know better than himself what is proper for him, what he wishes, and who, taking upon themselves the characters of confidants of his most secret thoughts, set his private will in opposition to his public desire, manifested by his acts of sovereignty, and who, pretending that success will absolve and explain every thing, expose their prince to those fatal suspicions, which we have seen followed by such fatal results. There never existed any thing more anarchical or more dangerous for a prince, than the fatal *Vive le Roi, quand même.* In what well regulated state would it ever be suffered? It is an invention of chivalric anarchy, subversive of all laws, of all public order, begotten, as it is said, among men, it is true, *au cœur*

patriarchal, but of superstitious, narrow minds, and therefore capable of any deceit, which can be artfully glossed over.

What right has the Chaplain of the King of Spain, to take upon himself the character of avenger of the King's wrongs, and to destroy his works? In opening the doors of the royal chapel to him, has he also admitted him through those of the council? In matters of state, what are the life-guards? They are to watch over the safety of the precious charge that is entrusted to them, that is their duty;—but to set themselves up as judges of the management of the State and of the King, and to pass from the guard of honor into the council chamber, is nothing less than an usurpation, a forgetfulness of all duty, a transposition of character, at which every one has a right to be astonished. From being sentinels about the person of the prince, they become representatives of the nation, organs of the secret thoughts of the prince, who assuredly never confided them to their ears;—in the post which they occupy, the perfection of discipline ought to be pre-eminent among them, but they threaten the people with the very weapons which are put into their hands for the purpose of watching over the father of the people. What madness, what perversion

of every principle of order and discipline! The gendarmes and life-guards of Berlin may be said to have produced the Prussian war by their tumultuous and outrageous boasting; they led the prince and the State to the treaty of Tilsit, or, in other words, to the foot of the grave;—they made more noise on parade, than on the field of battle.—In 1808, the life-guards caused the abdication of Charles the IVth; they laid violent hands on his minister, his friend, the prince of peace, a man of little consideration no doubt, but still a man, and in the service of their master; yet they were no more his judges, than they were those of the State, or of the resolutions of the prince. What right had they to intermix themselves with the people, and exclaim against their King? Principles are invariable; there are none made expressly for the life-guards of Charles the IVth: those of Ferdinand have absolved the soldiers of the Isle of Leon and of Naples. If one armed man makes himself judge of a cause, and styles it good by proclaiming it that of his chief, or of his king, why should not another armed man avail himself of the same pretext and the same rights, by investing with the name of the people that, which he may think proper to proclaim? All this is but anarchy; people must understand each other; Society does not exist by excep-

tions or acceptations of persons or of principles, but by their preservation in all times, and towards every one. What have the life-guards, who set the head of the Prince of Peace as the price of the abdication of the king, his friend and relation, to reproach the people with, who massacred the unfortunate chaplain? The assassins of the chaplain have committed a detestable, atrocious act, but are those, who pointed out the way to these attempts, worthy to cast the first stone? Every one has the right, it is the duty of all — excepting them. If the world is to be held together, it must be guided by these principles; *Vive le Roi, quand même* leads straight to dissolution; *Vive le Roi, quand même* is chivalric anarchy, an ingredient that must be carefully avoided in the formation of any society.

At the same time, some of the lower orders of those classes, whom misery and her legitimate offspring, ignorance, retain in a state of degradation of mind and sentiments, and who, most probably, excited by other men, that are to be seen in all disturbances, forgot the respect due to the Monarch, and raised an insolent clamour about his person. The Prince complained, and his complaints brought on a change of ministry. Ministries, in times

of revolution, are short and turbulent. It is a slippery post, from which, he, who is wanting in extension of views, and in the vigour requisite to hold the helm with firmness, quickly descends. But self-love is always at hand to blind mankind. They flatter themselves, that they can trifle with difficulties, which have overcome their predecessors. They reckon on their good fortune, which will desert them, as it did others. They give all their care to a few difficulties of detail, and whilst they are thus squandering away their strength, the torrent passes on, and draws them after it.

Such has been the fate of the Spanish Ministers. Merit was not wanting among them. Several carried about them the marks of a dearly proclaimed patriotism.* Their career has been short and stormy. They have been dismissed with a diminution, rather than an increase of reputation, and always from this reason, that they have not estimated the post they had to fill, at its highest value. Every

* Mr. Arguelès, member of the Cortes of Cadiz, prisoner at Ceuta in 1814, and Minister in 1820, could not write, in consequence of the loss of the fingers of his right hand, which had been destroyed by the pressure of his fetters. This man, in whom resentment would have appeared excusable, evinced a most exemplary moderation.

ministry has a double task to perform; first, to keep up the daily routine of business, which is both easy and subordinate; and secondly, to choose the direction and the fulcrum on which to place their lever, which last is the most difficult and important affair. It is the choice between these two, which classes the Ministers, and which ranks them either among the transient or durable, the limited and inferior, the superior or profound order.

In the Sitting of the 6th April, the new Spanish Ministers laid before the Cortes a message from the King, respecting the occurrences at Naples; to the assurances of security against foreign interference, founded upon the difference in the position of Spain and that of Naples, the Monarch added these remarkable words: *His Majesty is well aware, how fatal it is to the people, and to the princes themselves, to be placed in such a situation, as to give rise to a suspicion that they have not kept their promises or their oaths.* The Minister availed himself of this opportunity to demonstrate the happiness of Spain, in being governed by a King faithful to his word, and resolved to remain attached to the new order of things.

Extraordinary Cortes had been announced,

They commenced their Sittings on the 21st September, immediately after alarms and disturbances had broken out on several points. Another dismissal of the whole ministry took place: that of the war minister was alone effected. It appears that in Spain, whether it be from prudence, or want of ambition, (but these places are less sought after than any where else,) it was with great difficulty a Minister of War could be procured, several, to whom the situation was offered, having refused to accept it. Amongst the present Ministers there is one, M. Bardaxe, who is endowed with a lively, expansive, and enlightened mind, formed in the course of a long diplomatic career, and whose talents are not inferior to the weight of affairs, nor of the times.

In the course of fifteen months, Spain has seen three Sessions of the Cortes and two permanent Commissions. There must have been some motive for these quick returns of the meetings. It is this: *the Cortes found it necessary to reassemble, because they had done wrong in separating*. The constitutional Act is formed, it is true; but is that a sufficient reason for supposing every thing completed, and for leaving it to the care of others to infuse life

and motion into the work commenced? This was the great fault of the constituent assembly, which we saw hastening, with precipitation and delight, towards the end of its labours, abandoning the work of its creation in a cradle, which they saw their enemies ready to fill with serpents. The Cortes have done the same. They go and come, they take the helm and leave it, and finish their voyage before they have entered the port. This port is nothing less than the completion of the constitutional organization, which is wanting in every one of its articles, as the King has explained in his opening speech to the present Cortes. What is a Constitution without the organization of all its different members, and without a complete system? It is true, that it is the great spring of the machine; but, in order that this spring may act, the machine must be completed. The void that is created by the absence, and the encouragement it gives to restless characters, (for it is always during the recess that they sow disorder,) ought to impress the Cortes with the necessity of their presence. So soon as the Cortes disappear, the disorderly shew their heads. One might almost say, that they form the interim of the Cortes. During its absence, the Ministers appear to be almost without energy. One might

almost believe, that the Cortes have carried it away with them, and that it will return with them only. This teaches two lessons; first, that the national force lies with the Cortes; secondly, that without risking to do the same as the Constituent Assembly, the Cortes ought not to permit any interval in their sessions, so long as Spain be not entirely reconciled to its new system, and so long as any opposition lasts. The Cortes alone can counterbalance it. A permanent evil requires a remedy of the same nature.

But what is the nature of this opposition? It is of the most useless, the most frivolous, and, consequently, of the most contemptible species. Let an opposition range itself under chiefs worthy of command, actuated by great and generous motives, with forcible means, and having a probable aim, its grandeur, its dignity, strength, and possible result, attract the attention of the mind, announce an arranged plan, and pave the way for hope. Such were in France the struggles of the Condés, of the Colignis against the Court and the Guises; such was that of Spain against Napoleon. The mind may derive some satisfaction from such a contemplation, and it is of it only that I am now speaking. But secret oppositions,

underhand plots, little bickerings rather than conspiracies, highway conspirators, the rivals of malefactors and smugglers, curates and monks abandoning their flocks and their cells, to associate with banditti, and to join in excursions, absurdly armed, such a mixture of folly with fanaticism, of seduction and deception, excite at once pity and indignation, contempt and wrath, against the authors of these detestable manœuvres; detestable, because equally insulting to religion, to royalty, to reason, and to that which claims the greatest interest, to humanity. Will not the blood which these unfortunate men will shed, in consequence of their having been seduced by these infamous machinations, fall upon the heads of the seducers? And how can we refuse our tears to credulity, the victim of its own innocence and of foreign rascality? If human blood must be shed, it ought only to be so in those cases, when, according to the admirable expression of Burke, *the blood of man becomes the ransom of peace.*

In fact, what a hideous spectacle does not the Curate of Merino present, dragging behind him crowds of infatuated creatures, who, in their abused ignorance, believe they are serving God and the King! What infamous decep-

tion! What horrible hypocrisy! What a front must he not possess, who can thus degrade his ministry! and for what purpose? Part of these unfortunate creatures perish by the sword, are worn out by marches, as useless as they are harassing, and all these ill-advised men finish by suffering themselves to be taken at Salvatierra; and oh! most horrible and monstrous circumstance! sixty-one priests or monks were found amongst this ridiculous and sacrilegious assemblage, (see the official accounts;) and this is called serving God and the King, the altar and the throne! It is merely exposing them to be blasphemed. What have priests and monks to do with armed meetings? Some have taken upon themselves to exalt this forgetfulness of their duties, during the wars of La Vendée and of Spain; for morals are very accommodating in the eyes of some persons. That which is useful to them is always legitimate. In those cases, the motives may have furnished some excuse in the plan of propriety; but in the actual state of Spain, there is nothing to be perceived in such an action, but a prolonged and abominable attack upon religion, morals, and good sense.

Other hordes, which they would fain raise to the importance of conspirators, are wander-

ing all over Spain, in the same manner that the banditti and the smugglers have done in all ages. Spain is the native land of these malefactors. These land-corsairs resemble their predecessors at sea, who occupied themselves much more with lucrative captures, than about redressing political wrongs. France has also enjoyed the presence of these gentlemen of the high roads, who examined the old French Constitution, in the strong boxes of the *Diligences*.

Spain has become, as could not but happen, the object of much contradictory speculation. Controversies on opposite grounds are carried on, respecting the fate of the revolution. It is very well known, that much agitation exists in Spain. But what will it produce? That is a necessary subject of examination, and for that purpose, it will be requisite, first, to enquire into the elements of which Spain is composed.

This country is extensive, divided into large departments, which formed ancient kingdoms, of which Spain contained as many as sixteen. The mountains present obstacles to communication, the roads are scarce, the people sedentary, intercourse little cultivated. The capital,

placed in the centre of the State, is not, like London and Paris, a point of attraction, or of superior weight. Neither the strength of the State, nor its knowledge, have any common centre; they are to be found in the *cadre* of the State, in the great commercial towns, such as Cadiz, Grenada, Valencia, Barcelona, and Malaga. Commerce keeps alive the spirit of liberty. Strangers are at the head of trade. The aristocracy is to be found in the Castilles, in the neighbourhood of the dry and barren city of Madrid. There, appears the seat of the great empire of the Clergy and of the Nobles. These have lost the spirit of ancient feudality. The class of the Nobles is personally very much debased. During the war of the revolution, it did not once shine forth with éclat. The Clergy is no longer rich. The suppression of their principal revenue, the tithes, the sale of a part of their property, have made all interested people their adversaries. Its power, therefore, cannot be great. In its present state, the Clergy of Spain is an enervated body, any great exertion, in favour of the ancient system, appears, therefore, to be out of the question. The revolution has taken possession of the nation. A mass of intelligence, and a third estate have

come forth, the existence even of which was not suspected.

As it was silent, and gave free scope to ancient absurdities, it was not supposed to exist, and, by this means, as great an error was committed as in France in 1789. It was thought, also, that it was only necessary to go on, and that things would be done, because they had been done before. In order to prevail against the Spanish revolution, it would be necessary to remodel the whole nation, and then the same difficulty would exist, which has been experienced in other places. Admit the counter-revolution. What is to be re-established? Despotism? After what has taken place, that is impossible. Spain is not in the situation of Naples, where it only requires a foreign army to retain her under the yoke; but here, Spain herself must restore Spain to despotism, and maintain that system. But there are two things to be foreseen here; first, an opposition, which advances in the name of religion and of the King; secondly, a sanguine hope, inimical to the duration of the revolution, grounded upon this opposition. When a report is spread, of the constitutional stone or pillar being thrown down in some village, or paltry

little town, that the banditti have carried off horses and couriers, then a free scope is given to the most sinister hopes and conjectures against the revolution of Spain. There are no longer any limits set to joy and prognostication; but many motives may be pointed out, as proper to confound both the one and the other.

The number of opponents is large, I will allow; but they are partial; they are reduced to a divided force, in opposition to a collective one, that of public authority. This opposition may work a great deal of evil; it may cause many misfortunes to individuals; but to overturn, is beyond its power. Where is the country, which has not experienced as many, and perhaps, more misfortunes, immediately after a revolution? The finances are in a bad state. The enemies of the existing order will not neglect to increase this evil, which is their strength: *deficiency is their treasure.* The declared and armed opposition has succeeded very miserably for those who were engaged in it. The apostolical juntas of Gallicia have been dispersed, and the wrecks of them delivered up by Portugal. Some nobles and priests, who were engaged in the insurrections, have been conducted to the scaffold, and those

men who were inconsiderate enough to give vent to their joy, at the intelligence of the occurrences at Naples, received very rough notice of the impropriety of those demonstrations. General Elio stood in need of the aid of official delays, to escape the sentence which had condemned him. The concurrence of these facts does not promise much efficaciousness, to the attacks which may be meditated against the order, that has prescribed, so long as they arise only from the counter revolutionists, properly so called. These are impotent against the revolution, so long as they alone attack it; instead of retrograding, it would become stronger. The attempts of the ancient system of Spain against Spain renewed, would have no other effect, than to aggravate that revolution, as was the case in France, and to fall with greater weight on the heads of their authors. But it would be different, if secret combinations and correspondences, established between eminent chiefs, carried on in the centre of large towns of greater importance than the capital, endeavoured to give another aspect to this revolution. In such a case, two things only could be said, 1st, that the cause of the ancient system would be still more lost in this state of affairs, than in the present more moderate and more gentle

lution, as was the case in France, where the cause of the ancient system was more harshly treated by the Convention, than it had been by the Constituent Assembly. It is the folly of all counter revolutionists to place their hopes in the *worst*, and to try to undermine the strongest. If the first revolution of Spain give way before a second and more popular one, we may anticipate their being reserved for a very severe lesson. 2nd, If the feelings which are likely to effect a breach between the King and the party at the head of which Riego is placed, are not calmed by the interference of the cortes; if the military chiefs again change the form of the State, the affairs of Spain may assume a frightful aspect. The rivalship of ambition, cannot fail to raise its head, and the most terrible shocks may take place in the midst of a people, whose passions are gloomy, ardent, and sanguinary; the monarchy may be destroyed, the State shaken, for the face of the country is favourable to it, and the issue of all this becomes inconceivable. Europe may again be agitated by the convulsions of Spain, as she was by those of France, and we may distinctly perceive that a new source of declamations against revolutions and the liberals will be opened. But we shall not its authors say, whether they who have

manœuvred the despotism since 1814, in such a manner as to bring about the revolution of 1820, have not also governed this in such a manner as to cause that which will aggravate it. But this is the real pith of the question.

May heaven avert from us this storm, the consequences of which would be so fatal.

But whence arise all these imperfections? From the institutions, from the government. The same cause which has rendered the Neapolitans poltrons, and unfit for warfare, has rendered the Spaniards fit for civil broils, and approaching nearer the manners of Africa, than to those of Europe. If the Spaniard, in the terrible paroxysms of anger and revenge, play with the blood, and the mutilated members of his victim, who has superintended his moral education? Who has paid any attention to it? What religious instruction has he received? In what light has it been pointed out to him? What have his monks preached to him? What method did the Government, and its great support, the inquisition, make use of? Tortures and scaffolds. The people are as they have been formed; they are the result of their institutions, and when these have only tended to render them the slaves of absurd bigotry, and

of ferocious despotism, they are said to be incapable of restraint, without pity, without manners. They have been kept apart from all civilisation, they have all the vices consequent on such a position: they have been brought up surrounded by superstition, slavery, and the utmost vulgarity of manners and of habits, and are found imbued with all the vices which these sources of corruption are likely to impart; the effects correspond exactly with the causes; there exists a certain scale, by which the state of all nations may be appreciated, it is that of their institutions, and of their relative situation with regard to civilisation. One cannot speak of Spain, previous to the expulsion of the Moors; she was but a ground of contention, of which two people, and two faiths, disputed the possession. And into what hands, oh heavens! has she since fallen, and what has been her Government? Charles the Vth, and his son Philip the IInd deprived her of her liberties, and plunged her into the purest despotism. Spain covered Europe and America with her soldiers, but without deriving much benefit from it. The whole reign of the Austrian dynasty presents only a series of battles, equally unfortunate; the whole of this period might be termed *a lost battle;* the conclusion of this dynasty replaced a monarchy in the greatest

extremity, in the hands of Philip the Vth. I am not painting pictures according to my own fancy or feelings; read the memoirs of Saint Simon, and of the Marquis of Louville, both of them intimate with that Prince; on reading them, the question that naturally presents itself to the mind is, whether one would choose to reign over a country in such a dilapidated state? The French dynasty removed some evils, but it operated no radical change, and in 1808, as in 1820, things had arrived at a point, without parallel in any European State, or in any civilised society. No, it is not the spirit of revolt, of faction, and of disorganization, which has breathed an infectious air over Spain; it is the poisonous blast of the two-fold source of the degradation of human nature,—superstition, and despotism; it is the *far niente* of a Government, devoted to the observance of etiquette, and blinded to any enquiry into the state, and the wants of the country; it was the fatal discord that reigned in the royal house in 1807, and 1808, that called in the aid of the foreigner, and with him a revolution; it was the Confessors Lainé, and Daubanton, who governed the state by the conscience of the Prince; it was the favorites, such as the Duke of Lerma, the Princesses of Ursins, the Princes of the peace, the Camarille. These

are the causes which effected the revolution in Spain, and which are sufficient to produce a hundred, instead of one. Do you expect to escape from revolutions, where you maintain the empire, and the works of folly, by means of the scaffold? You might sooner avoid the effects of a contagion, when the air is impregnated with its poisonous effluvia.

It is false, and I have proved it so in my preceding works, that the revolution of Spain, was, like those of Naples and Lisbon, levelled against religion and royalty; on the contrary, more attentive observers will discover a confirmation of, and homage rendered to both. Religion consists of dogmas, of regulations of discipline, of temples, and of the necessary ministers. In what have any of these indispensable attributes been injured? The Jesuits, the multiplicity of monks, the inquisition, the excessive wealth of the Clergy, its number so disproportionate to the real necessity for them, do these constitute religion? On the contrary, are they not the cause of the attacks that have been made upon her? The religion of Spain has been purified and not degraded, has it not been declared the exclusive worship of the State?

It is the same with regard to royalty; true,

she has descended from the immeasurable height upon which she was seated; her power has been diminished, perhaps too much so: but were not her acts fresh in the memory at the same time? Has she not been recognized and confirmed by the revolution? Has not the Prince received every species of homage? And in order to complete the question, if any plans had existed against royalty, who could have prevented their being put in execution? Where was the Prince's own strength? Where were the supports of the throne to be found? For my own part, I look upon what the revolutions of the south have effected for royalty, as being the most striking confirmation of this social institution, and as the most formal recognition of its necessity in the modern State of society. I should be happy, if, by placing this great event upon a more extensive point of view, than that, in which it is generally regarded, I could dissipate prejudice and recal the mind to a just appreciation of things.

The rapid and radical change, which Spain and Portugal have undergone, offer two subjects of deep meditation:

1st, Judging by appearances only, these two

countries were the last in Europe that were likely to be troubled by a revolution.

In no part was the authority of Rome, of the clergy, of the throne, and of habit, so well established, and exercised with less resistance and opposition; one day sufficed, and every thing crumbled into dust. One step farther, schism would have taken the lead, the constituent assembly would have been surpassed; one step farther, and a republic must have been declared. The Cortes have restricted the royal authority more than the Constituent Assembly did: the last allowed itself time, and tried its strength against it, but in Spain the Cortes have marched directly against it, and concluded every thing at the same moment.

The aspect of so sudden, so radical a transition, which carries with it a formal disavowal of all the received notions on the state of Spain and Portugal, becomes the natural subject of reflection, to every one who is not the born slave of prejudice; are we not authorized to conclude, 1st, that these countries were imperfectly known; 2d, that the supports, upon which the ancient edifice rested, had no longer any strength? I am very much deceived, if the truth be not to be found in this.

In speaking of the French Revolution, Burke says, that under the semblance of the ancient system, a new world had silently formed itself, of which the government was not aware. It was the same in Spain and in Portugal; the Court saw it not, nor was it perceived abroad; people continued to see and to judge in the midst of a new State, in the same manner as they would have done in the old. Hence arose the mistake; a new Spain had formed itself, it was the ancient one only that was thought of. Can a great mass of men change in a day? The alteration was for a long time gradually effecting itself in Spain, as well as every where else; the ground was quietly undermined, and it only required the raising of the curtain to demonstrate the existence of New Spain. The causes are as follow:

1st, The progress of intelligence, in which Spain had participated with less noise, but with as much success, as any other country;—the Encyclopædia was not written there, but it had penetrated into the country, and the authors of this work are not the only persons who are endowed with perspicuity. Those who read the *Travels* of Messrs. Delaborde and Bourgoyne might, on seeing the pictures of the great number of learned men and of patriotic establish-

ments which Spain possesses, suspect what she concealed, and of what she was capable. A general habit existed, in the writings on Spain, of speaking only of Monks and the Inquisition; —it may have been supposed, that every Spaniard was born a brother of some convent, or a familiar of the holy office, but Spain was no longer in this situation; these establishments no longer belonged to the body of the State; Spain was not much behind the rest of Europe either in liberality or philosophy.

2d, Spain had been a spectator of the French Revolution for twenty-five years, during fifteen of which she had experienced its immediate effect; it was therefore impossible that she should not have been, in some degree, affected by it.

3d, In Spain, power required a nucleus; Madrid, at a distance from commerce, placed in a desert, could not supply it; the strength of the State was spread among the commercial towns on the borders of the Mediterranean, and in Cadiz. Madrid was the counterpart of Versailles, receiving every thing from the presence of the King, but adding nothing to his power. Until this time, Madrid was the capital of the indolence and misery of Spain, whilst Cadiz was

the capital of her riches. The new system has effected a happy revolution for Madrid, by rendering it the centre of national action; there is therefore some reason for its attaching itself to the new system.

The union of these causes had effected a change in Spain, and had not been sufficiently remarked.

The second subject for reflection is, the facility with which the ancient institutions, on which the altar and the throne of Spain were supposed to be placed, have disappeared. What has become of them? A breath of wind has overturned them. They were believed to be objects of veneration, they were only objects of wrath and derision. It was thus that the parliaments of France vanished at the first contact with the Revolution, and perished without noise and without regret. For two hundred years they were considered the pivots of the State, and the support of the throne; a single day, a single word, was sufficient to efface them for ever. Why is it that this has happened in Spain as well as in France? Because, in both countries, these bodies had no longer any hold on the nation; because a greater degree of intelligence, having penetrated into the different

members of society, had dissolved the whole of their composition; because, by a complete but secret transposition of character, they were no longer capable of lending their support, but, on the contrary, stood in need of it.

The Revolution of Spain has become the theme of the imprecations and menaces of the aristocracy, and, in fact, it has received a terrible shock. In its ideas, Spain was the immoveable citadel of good old principles, the Christian Hercules, whose club was alone sufficient to annihilate the weak and tremulous flock of Liberals; the Spanish Government of 1814 was the prototype of all paternal and solid government, propitious alike to the prince and to the people, but, in one day, old times, old principles, Hercules, citadel, all disappear, all vanish;—in its place arises a new Spain, which has nothing in common with its ancient predecessor, and, as misfortunes never come singly, the contagion reaches to Naples, Portugal, America, and the Brazils; the Spanish Constitution becomes, as it were, *the rage*, and this constitutional system, the subject of so many misfortunes, goes on, extending itself without limits, and leaves in the midst of impotency and ridicule . . . . . .

It must be acknowledged, that anger was

never more legitimate, for never was disappointment more complete, or more widely diffused; the regenerated Spaniards have, therefore, since that time, lost considerably in the estimation of their ancient friends; they only wished for the proud Castilians, with their mantles of ancient days; they will not recognize them under the modern costume, adopted by new Spain, whom they rank amongst the deserters of the good cause, and the abettors of liberalism, the source of all perdition. They turn against them the thunder of their eloquence and their thunderbolts of war, and threaten them at the same time with the Conservators and the Cossacks—Such is the fate they decree to Spain, and as much is held in reserve for others, but she must occupy their attention first; being the capital of the other revolutions, the preference belongs to her, for never was a more grievous hoax played upon Aristocracy.

But a variety of questions here present themselves. Spain is recognized under her new system of government, in the same manner as she was under the old one. External legitimacy is thus allied to internal legitimacy, and the union of these two branches of legitimacy forms complete legitimacy; it does not exist under any other form in any part of the world; England,

Sweden, all are alike on this point. The ambassadors of Spain are admitted at all the Courts, and in their ancient rank; the King of Spain is the same who reigned on the 31st Dec. 1819; he was not changed on the 1st of Jan. 1820, the epoch of the Revolution. He has sanctioned the new system, he strengthens it by all his Acts, every one of his speeches confirm his adhesion to it; but foreigners proclaim Spain revolutionary, Spaniards as rebels, and treat as rebels all those whom the Prince admits into his council, whom the nation has chosen for her legislators, who command the armies of the King of Spain; her ambassadors are termed representatives of a captive and of rebels; and, at the tribune of France, voices, which ought never to be heard beyond the limits of France, for those are the limits of her jurisdiction, have taxed with rebellion the Revolution of Spain; writings have not ceased to insult the chiefs of this Revolution, and to threaten with foreign interference. What does this mean? Good heavens! where are right, and decency, and prudence to be found? Right? What is the nature of a jurisdiction over a neighbouring State, a foreign one? Europe admits and you accuse, the King of Spain sanctions and you insult: he declares himself satisfied, he complains of no one—you declare him discontented,

and treat those as criminals to whom he reproaches nothing. It is then always and every where *Vive le Roi, quand même!* this cry has passed the Pyrenees. At the least agitation that affects Spain, the cry is, All is lost; the Liberals shall be punished according to their deserts; you grieve at the evils of Spain, and all those evils are the work of ridiculous and incorrigible conspirators, who would do the same for Ferdinand the VIIth, that was done in other places for Lous XVIth. Are they then Liberals, who ravaged the country with the Curate Merino, with the apostolic junta of the Galicias, who recruited for the new army of the faith, and with the armed bands who plotted with the chaplain Vinezula, and with the life-guards, who break and spit upon the constitutional pillars, as in France, the trees of liberty were cut down—whose joy burst forth at the news of the events at Naples? and yet, these are the acts which have caused the disorders that occur in Spain, which, without them, would be the most peaceable country in the world. In order to accuse the Liberals of these disorders, it ought to be shewn that they are the instigators of these acts, for they only are the authors of the evil. Finally, that which is done for Spain is nothing new, for it is the same, more or less, that has been done in France for the

last thirty years. In that, as in every thing else, we must commence by laying down principles. They only can enlighten and guide safely.

1st, Has the Spanish Constitution been formed in a revolutionary manner? In order to assert this, the Cortes of 1812 must be declared revolutionary, for it is their work; it dates from 1812. It would be curious to see the title of revolutionists conferred upon the members of the Cortes of 1812, that is, upon the most intrepid supporters which a throne ever possessed.

2d, Had this Constitution been previously accepted by the King, who afterwards yielded to other suggestions? Is it not on the basis of an anterior promise, that the different powers have grounded their recognition of the new system? What has been the government of Spain since 1814? Would she not have perished, but for the Revolution? Did not the throne totter under the weight of the errors of those who encircled it? Instead of what is called a Revolution, in the criminal acceptation of the word, has not a genuine restoration taken place in Spain; and, without it, would not the throne, the princes, the State, every thing have

fallen into a general, inevitable, and not far distant precipice? Would not every thing have been swallowed up at the same moment? Was there ever a shipwreck more evident or more complete? Oh! how transient is the memory of accusers! Let them refresh their memories by the perusal of the Report, made at the opening of the first Cortes, by the Minister of the Interior in the name of the King; what a picture! what an image of perfect dissolution! what times past, what present, and what future! When things have attained this height; when the end of human association has been forgotten and neglected to such a degree, revolution is no longer possible, for there is no longer any life to be lost in the bosom of death. Man then recovers his original state of independence, and society dissolved is but a vast shipwreck, in which every individual seizes the plank that can support him on the waves—it is the case of natural defence. The Revolution was the plank upon which Spain sought an asylum against the waves of absurd and shameful oppression which overwhelmed her. Does human nature, when forced into her last retrenchments, owe her last sigh to the authority which destroys her? Is it not one of those extreme cases, in which all the fault lies with the authors of those sufferings, which can only be guarded

against by irregular means? Is it not also the social bond which presents itself, and in which the parties have certainly not stipulated, that the governed should exist only for the governors? To what a scrutiny do not imprudent accusers give rise! Every thing which leads to insurrection should be held in abhorrence, but we must also detest that which outrages human nature, and leaves it no other resource.* It is she who claims the first rights, and it is in the union of hers with those of authority, that the peace of both are to be found. No doubt, there may be discovered in the first exertion against established authority, that, which in the poverty of our language,† and in the paucity of our means of social defence, may be termed revolt or rebellion, which simply signifies *the opposition of force to force;* but when the conflict is over, when the parties are reconciled, and

* Enlightened minds, for whom I write, will not mistake the sense of my words. Reason and human nature have nothing in common with insurrection;—I defend the rights of the two first, and leave the latter to those, who discover insurrection only in that which is reasonable, or which disturbs them; to them, order is the support of their anarchy. It is shameful to be obliged to think, that in our times, such a notice should be necessary.

† See what M. Guizot has said, in his new work, or rather his new *chef-d'œuvre*, respecting this poverty of language, in comparison with the exigences of the times.

when a settled system has replaced the one which did exist, then every thing proceeds in the regular order of societies, and a claim is acquired to the respect which they every where enjoy; it would then be a neglect of all duty, to insult those who have effected the alteration, and those who have conformed to it. It is an *act of oblivion* which throws a veil over the past, to insure the peace of the future; without that, peace would be impossible.

To this serious disregard of right and decency, must be added that of prudence; a virtue so necessary in affairs, and so neglected by existing passions.

Zeal for royalty is become a standard which may be termed vulgar. Under its protection, and, as in a fortified post, a multitude of men vent their rage against all those who do not coincide with some of their ideas. This zeal is in itself laudable, but, in order to preserve this honorable title, it must not be separated from judgment, nor from the respect due to the object, it pretends to serve. Is it by vomiting forth imprecations against every thing that it does and agrees to, that the throne is respected? Is it by compromising the Prince at every instant, that he can be served? Is there a sha-

dow of judgment in seeking to persuade the world, that he does not act freely, that he approves and even desires the dangerous resource of opposition, that his heart is on your side, and in giving a colouring of bad faith to his actions, which is only fit to deprive him of the confidence and love of those of whom he stands most in need in his present situation? The King of Spain complained of these manœuvres in his opening speech to the Cortes on the 1st March, 1821. Can a more cruel service be rendered him, than to weaken public confidence in his sincerity? His bitterest enemies could not work a greater evil for him. It is there that his real danger lies; the ways of dissimulation would lead to a precipice. How could one flatter one's self with the hope of escaping from the observation of so many eyes, interested to see and to penetrate into every thing, and from such a load of suspicion, always ready to pervert and to aggravate? Do not let us conceal, that, what the interest of every one, and particularly of royalty, most requires in these days, is faith in its sincerity. For the last thirty years,* endeavours have been made to deprive crowns of the magnificent emblem; *Europe is on the alert.* So many things and so many men

* See the Memoires of Ferrières.

have forfeited their promises, that one can only believe what is seen or palpably felt. Every true friend of royalty, every one who understands the real interests of the King of Spain, will form the most ardent and sincere wishes, that every thing around him may shine with the most brilliant clearness, that the piercing eye of malevolence may not perceive the least blemish in his actions;—his safety rests upon the faith which he may create in himself. In the present state of the world, to create faith in royalty is to create royalty itself; to annihilate faith is to annihilate royalty; it may be said of it as of the church, without it there is no hope.

A strange mode has been adopted, of shewing zeal for the King of Spain, namely, that of continually presenting to his eyes his former state and his decline. Is it not approaching to his lips a cup of bitterness, which the least sentiment of delicacy ought to have averted? Is it not recalling to his memory the causes of his fall? Admitted, he is no longer absolute. What has this absolute power effected? What would he effect with it now? What good did his father derive from it? Was it not that which carried them both to Bayonne? Under a Constitution, would they ever have under-

taken that journey? To be happy, is it then necessary to be absolute? Is human nature only a commodity to serve the happiness of the absolute? Without being absolute, is the destiny of the King of Great Britain unhappy? and have any of his ancestors appeared disgusted with it?

But let us go still further; let us pass on to still higher considerations; let us examine history. What information will she give us, that all the outcries against the Spanish Constitution proceed from ignorance? By a very singular concurrence, it appears, that Spain, anterior to despotism, is as little known as Spain anterior to liberty. In the year 1800, people saw Spain as it always was, but nothing was more false. In Spain, as in the rest of Europe, despotism was the new order. The old order was that of liberty, and in speaking of liberty, one appears to be speaking of some newly discovered country; she was common right. Absolute power is only of three hundred years standing in Europe. In Russia, since the time of the Czar Peter, there, where it exists in its greatest strength, it is the younger brother of the others. In the 16th century, the Czars intituled their acts as is now the

case in constitutional countries. *The Boyards have advised; the Czar will command.* It was Charles the Vth and his son who broke down the liberties of the Spaniards. Robertson,*

* Robertson's History of Charles the Vth.

Page 125 of the introduction.—The royal prerogative, extremely limited in every feudal kingdom, was circumscribed in Spain within such narrow bounds, as reduced the power of the Sovereign almost to nothing. The privileges of the nobility were great in proportion, and extended so far as to border on absolute independence. The immunities of the cities were likewise greater than in other feudal kingdoms; they possessed considerable influence in the Cortes, and they aspired at obtaining more. Such a state of society, in which the political machine was so ill-adjusted, and the several members of the legislature so improperly balanced, produced internal disorders in the kingdom of Spain, which rose beyond the pitch of turbulence and anarchy, unusual under the feudal government. The whole tenour of the Spanish history confirms the truth of this observation; and when the mutinous spirit, to which the genius of their policy gave birth and vigour, was no longer restrained and overawed, by the immediate dread of the Moorish arms, it broke out into more frequent insurrections against the government of their princes, as well as more outrageous insults on their dignity, than occur in the annals of any other country. These were accompanied, at some times, with more liberal sentiments concerning the rights of the people, at other times, with more elevated notions concerning the privileges of the nobles, than were common in other nations.

In the principality of Catalonia, which was annexed to the kingdom of Arragon, the impatience of the people to obtain the redress of their grievances having prompted them to take arms against their Sovereign, John II. they, by a solemn deed, recalled the oath of allegiance which they had sworn to him,

observes, that previous to the 15th century, Spain was the country of Europe which enjoyed the greatest liberty, in which royalty was confined within the narrowest limits, in

declared him and his posterity to be unworthy of the throne, and endeavoured to establish a republican form of government, in order to secure the perpetual enjoyment of that liberty after which they aspired. Nearly about the same period, the indignation of the Castilian nobility against the weak and flagitious administration of Henry IV. having led them to combine against him, they arrogated, as one of the privileges belonging to their order, the right of trying and of passing sentence on their Sovereign. That the exercise of this power might be as public and solemn as the pretension to it was bold, they summoned all the nobility of their party to meet at Avila. A spacious theatre was erected in a plain without the walls of the town. An image, representing the King, was seated on a throne, clad in royal robes, with a crown on its head, a sceptre in its hand, and the sword of justice by its side. The accusation against the King was read, and the sentence of deposition was pronounced, in presence of a numerous assembly. At the close of the first article of the charge, the Archbishop of Toledo advanced, and tore the crown from the head of the image; at the close of the second, the Conde de Placentia snatched the sword of justice from its side; at the close of the third, the Conde de Benevente wrested the sceptre from its hand; at the close of the last, Don Diego Lopez de Stuniga tumbled it headlong from the throne. At the same instant, Don Alphonso, Henry's brother, was proclaimed King of Castile and Leon, in his stead.

The most daring leaders of faction would not have ventured on these measures, nor have conducted them with such public ceremony, if the sentiments of the people concerning

which legal liberty was the most anciently known, and in which the third estate enjoyed the most extensive privileges, and shewed itself the most jealous of them. Ancient Spain had

the royal dignity had not been so formed by the laws and policy to which they were accustomed, both in Castile and Catalonia, as prepared them to approve of such extraordinary proceedings, or to acquiesce in them.

Page 219.—In all the public writs which he now issued, as King of Spain, he assumed the title of *Majesty*, and required it from his subjects, as a mark of their respect. Before that time, all the Monarchs of Europe were satisfied with the appellation of *Highness* or *Grace*.

Page 308.—Nor were the proceedings of the Commons the effects merely of popular and tumultuary rage; they aimed at obtaining redress of their political grievances, and an establishment of public liberty on a secure basis; objects worthy of all the zeal which they discovered in contending for them. The feudal government in Spain was at that time in a state more favourable to liberty than in any other of the great European kingdoms. This was owing chiefly to the number of great cities in that country, a circumstance I have already taken notice of, and which contributes, more than any other, to mitigate the rigour of the feudal institutions, and to introduce a more liberal and equal form of government. The inhabitants of every city formed a great Corporation, with valuable immunities and privileges. They were delivered from a state of subjection and vassalage; they were admitted to a considerable share in the legislature; they had acquired the arts of industry, without which cities cannot subsist; they had accumulated wealth, by engaging in commerce; and, being free and independent themselves, were ever ready to act as the guardians of the public freedom and independence. The genius of the internal government estab-

preceded England a hundred years in the career of liberty. She had more clearly determined its principles; she has remained in the back ground, because England has preserved her Parliaments, and she has lost them; which has happened to the rest of Europe, and will happen wherever there do not exist any political assemblies; then the power is concentered in one hand, which uses it for its own purposes, and against whomsoever would share in it, it opposes exclusive possession to social order, and treats those who would grasp at it, as rebels and Liberals.

The present Spanish Constitution is only a *resumé* of the ancient Constitutions of that country. Its editors are not the inventors of it; they have hardly added any thing of their own. In establishing it, they have only restored the

lished among the inhabitants of cities, which, even in countries where despotic power prevails most, is democratical and republican, rendered the idea of liberty familiar and dear to them. Their representatives in the Cortes were accustomed, with equal spirit, to check the encroachments of the King and the oppression of the nobles. They endeavoured to extend the privileges of their own order; they laboured to shake off the remaining encumbrances, with which the spirit of feudal policy, favourable only to the nobles, had burdened them, and conscious of being one of the most considerable orders in the State, were ambitious of being the most powerful.

nation to its right and property; by what right, by what act agreed to by her, was she deprived of it? Was this deprivation legitimate? Can a nation be stript of its constituted rights? Can the Prince make a law for himself exclusive of the people? If these rights have been taken away from it, can it not repossess itself of them? Which of the two is the most legitimate?

This is in fact, the whole question relative to Spain.

A sincere friend to humanity, to Spain, to her King, and to France, will not err in his desires, he will only form one, namely, that, that country should complete its revolution as speedily as possible; the voyage once began, one must only think of arriving in the harbour. Woe to him who *looks back after having once put his hand to the plough of revolutions,* the precipice awaits him, for to retrograde is impossible. Whenever an immense mass of men and of interests have taken a certain direction, delay, recoil, hesitation becomes awful; the only hope lies in facilitating the means, and in the acceleration of the voyage; to delay on the road, and to dig one's grave become synonymous. Instead then of invoking the Cossacks against

Spain, as was done so loudly and so rashly at the time of the expedition of Naples, instead of reprobating Spain, we must only think of impelling her towards the port, of calming the adverse winds, and in case of necessity, of towing her towards the end of her laborious passage.

This would be rendering her a service, of which she would acknowledge the value, which she would appreciate to the full as well as the malevolence, of which she knows herself to be the object; her interests lead her too much to inquire into the most secret dispositions for her to be blinded as to their nature; the interests of the two countries depend entirely on their intimate connection. In the present state of Europe, they cannot be separated without causing an immense injury to both, without annihilating each other; commercial Spain is one of the greatest necessities of France. Spain has latterly laid heavy restrictions on commerce; who can say, whether the Cortes have not endeavoured to revenge themselves by this severity, for the little favor they have met with in France? The people are exposed to pay very dearly for the passions of their governors. State affairs should always be conducted in a region superior to them.

Spain has within a short time, been attacked by the most horrible scourge, her inhabitants have fallen by thousands under its strokes; it has changed her most flourishing cities, her most fertile plains into immense graves. Miserable Spain! what hast thou done unto Heaven to deserve all thou sufferest? and even in this scourge, which only excites sentiments of humanity, cruel policy, the usurper of these days, finds a motive for exercising its deceptions. *It is the punishment of Heaven*, say those men, who, too short-sighted to see what passes upon earth, imagine themselves possessed of the faculty of reading the heavens; who, ignorant of the most simple effects, confidently arrogate to themselves the title of interpreters and instruments of Heaven; hypocritical and ridiculous language, calculated to mask secret intentions, and to re-establish the subverted, but convenient empire of superstition. Thus, when at the commencement of the revolution of America, the city of Caraccas was swallowed up by a tremendous earthquake, lying Monks persuaded a credulous people, that Heaven thus manifested its anger against the revolution. As it was not very difficult to persuade bigotted Negroes, ignorant Indians, and superstitious Spaniards, the falsehood produced its effects. Christopher Columbus succeeded in the same

manner with the Mexicans, by means of astronomical knowledge, which was common in Europe, but unknown to this infant people. Many others have made use of the same deception; and have found men willing to swallow the bait. But is it not scandalous, that such arts should be attempted in Europe in the nineteenth century. Is it against irritated Heaven, that those generous disciples of Esculapius have been combating, those heroes of humanity, the honor of their art, the glory of France, who have not feared to enter the seat of pestilence, for the purpose of snatching from its grasp present victims, and of preventing by their learned observations, the sacrifice of fresh ones? Thus, benefactress of the future as well as of the present, Science does not limit her effects to any time, or place, or age; and if success has crowned exertions, ennobled by such generous motives, do not the French physicians, who have encountered the exterminating angel of Barcelona, deserve, that the gratitude of the universe should raise the statue of these health-restoring mortals on the altars of the fabulous deity of Epidaurus? No, it is not the hand of God, which these blasphemers transform into a demon of homicide, that has empoisoned the air, and mows down, by its cruel attacks, the wretched population of Bar-

celona; no, it is not the Creator, who has placed the scythe of death in the hands of this Eumenides, and who has let it loose against the innocent creatures of his hand; the thought, the idea itself, is impious; it is ignorance, and negligence, that is to say, want of institutions with all the evils in its train. The yellow fever rages at Barcelona, as that of fear does at Naples; the pestilence has made subjects in Spain as fear did in Naples. How should it be otherwise with men, covered with hereditary rags, heaped together in streets inaccessible to the air, in houses full of fœtid odours, and who are as great fatalists as the Turks, full of a thousand prejudices, and abandoned to the most miserable sanitary system, little assisted by art, slaves of habit, the victims of contraband trade, the vehicle of these diseases; forgetting on the morrow the evils they have undergone the preceding day, and concealed among themselves, beings, stupid enough to believe, and others, deceitful enough to repeat in the midst of the generations which disappear, that, which the Turks also exclaimed in the midst of their calamities, Allah! allah! God is great, and Mahomet is his prophet! Are not these fine remedies, and with them, does not Spain threaten Europe with a second Turkey, isolated

by a continual contagion, and obliging one part of the population of Europe to mount guard over the other? We arrive at this point; the yellow fever, newly arrived in Europe, unknown in America forty years back, threatens from the redoubled communications which will be established between the two countries, to take root in Europe; it may become epidemical, you may begin to prepare lazarets.

I have attributed the facility, with which contagion spreads among the Spaniards, to the want of institutions, of public and private precautions, and of cleanliness, as much with regard to materials, as to persons: here are the proofs,

1st. In 1819, the Asia, man of war, of seventy-four guns, sailed from the Havannah, infected with the fever; she lost part of her crew on the passage, and yet sailed directly into the harbour of Cadiz. If the government vessels do this, what can be expected from mere merchantmen.

2nd. Ministerial complaisance towards a cousin, who was likely to be fatigued by a long quarantine, introduced this terrible enemy a second time. Again were thousands of men

cut down by the habits of the people of the south.

3rd. Letter from Docter Pariset, Barcelona, 31th October, 1821.

Yes, the disease that desolates Barcelona, is certainly the yellow fever of America.

Yes, it has been imported.

Yes, and I repeat it a thousand times, it is contagious. Let us hope, that the facts, which we shall accumulate, will completely confute the partisans of the contrary system.

Yes, this fever is a thousand times more fatal to commerce, than the most rigorous system of quarantine. With five days of good police and firmness, Barcelona and her commerce would have been preserved, and that by the confession of the anti-contagionists of this country. But what! they squabble and dispute together, whilst the evil enters, ravages, kills and they know not how to cure it; here, all labour, all industry, all prosperity, prostrates itself and dies for a long time; the heart even becomes depraved, the father flies from his

children, and all human feelings are lost. Oh! that the administration may act with vigour, and not compromise itself in this mass of folly and iniquity.

The municipal junta was informed a few days since, that there was a house shut up in Nomad Street, from which issued a most offensive smell, and that every now and then the cries of a child were heard. They proceeded to the house, opened it, and found the corpse of a young man, disfigured by the yellow fever, who had been dead four or five days; near this corpse was that of a dying woman: this body also much disfigured, but still retained a portion of warmth, and upon it was found a child at the breast, which, tormented by famine, was crying while it gnawed the bosom of its mother.

A public house, which had fifteen inhabitants, has lost eleven; the house next to it had twenty-seven, of which twenty-four are dead.

In Nao Street are three establishments of thirty-six persons; all died.

At Tortosa, the Bishop and all his family have fallen victims to it; the episcopal palace is

empty; even a poor Jesuit, to whom the Bishop had granted an asylum, is also dead.

Whole convents dead.

Whole houses deprived of inhabitants; streets almost deserted.

All the secretaries of the municipality dead.

All the doctors, excepting one, Mr. Texidort, dead.

All the apothecaries, excepting one, dead.

These are scenes which recal to the mind the siege of Jerusalem. Have we any cause for accusing a government, which, being master of the country whence the yellow fever proceeds, and which is in constant communication with it, neither takes measures to ascertain the existence of the contagion, nor precautions to prevent its introduction. It suffers its own vessels and merchant vessels to enter its ports, without taking any previous measures; the few that do exist are not executed, so relaxed, so impaired are all the springs of government; a minister suffers *his cousin* to land at the risk of infecting a whole country; and this is called go-

verning! Let all the governments of Europe arouse at the name of this peril, the greatest that ever threatened Europe. She is evidently menaced with invasion by the yellow fever, the same as she was by the small pox, and the yellow fever will reduce her to the state to which *papal Rome* has been reduced by the *aria cativa*. We are marching towards it with hasty strides, if the governments do not hasten to banish it from our shores. This would form the subject of a beautiful and very legitimate *Holy Alliance;* nor would it meet with any opposition.

Portugal.

Portugal presents a picture nearly similar to that of Spain, but with this difference in its favor, that it is exempt from the troubles and the opposition which Spain experiences.

The Revolution of Portugal, like that of Spain, was the work of a military insurrection; both, conceived under a despotism, were born under a flag; both were adopted unanimously; both have followed the same steps with regard to Rome, the clergy, and the inquisition; the whole of the ancient religious edifice fell at the same time in both countries. The principal features of the Portuguese Constitution are similar

to those of Spain; they are more restrictive towards royal authority, and, in order to complete the resemblance, Portugal is hardly less embarrassed with the Brazils, than Spain is with America. Were I asked the question, why Portugal is exempt from the disturbances which agitate Spain? I should reply:

1st. That this country is less extended, less divided, and less populous, than Spain; the difference between them is that of a province to a kingdom.

2d. That the classes, which, in all countries, form or foment opposition, are far from being of the same consistency in Portugal as in Spain.

3d. That the strength of Portugal is centred in two towns, Oporto and Lisbon: they are the two grand pivots of Portugal; the contrary exists in Spain. Madrid is of no consequence to Spain; while Lisbon is to Portugal what London is to England, or Paris to France. The Czar Peter, on leaving Paris, turned towards that city, and, viewing its vast extent with the eye of genius, which penetrates and distinguishes at once the principles and consequences of every thing, pronounced these prophetic words: *Let the King of France take care that he*

does not quarrel with his Capital. Sixty years before, Charles the First had experienced the danger of quarrelling with London. The King of Portugal is also greatly interested in keeping upon good terms with Lisbon. This city possesses great commercial activity, which is kept up by a population consisting of almost as many foreigners as natives, a species of Cosmopolites, with but few local affections, and whose minds are less disposed to subordination than those of men attached to the glebe, and who, in their isolation, see and hear nothing.

4th. The Portuguese army, acting in a country much more circumscribed than Spain, has a greater influence over it than the Spanish army could obtain over the population of Spain.

5th. The narrow limits of the country admit of a more active inspection, both on the part of the government and of individuals; on small theatres, every thing lays open to the eye, every thing can be observed and noticed in an instant; it is not the same with a large one, the proscenium of which admits of several curtains. Portugal pursues its Revolution peaceably, both in a political and moral point of view; the excesses, violence, and injuries, which have taken place in Spain, have not hitherto

been remarked in Portugal. May heaven for ever preserve her from them.

After some irregularities, which are inseparable from a complete change in a State, the constitutional work was proceeded in. The Cortes were convoked, the elections were concluded without opposition, and on the 20th January, 1821, Portugal possessed her constituent Cortes. As a Constitution is to a State, the same that a foundation is to a building, so that was the first object of the attention of the Cortes. At the same time that Portugal proceeded in this direction, the colonies determined also not to remain without a Constitution, according to the example of the mother country, and, in consequence, they took the necessary steps. Madeira declared herself on the 10th February, 1821, and the Brazils on the 11th of the same month. It will be perceived that, although at a great distance, they followed fast one upon the other. The King, finding himself pressed by the generally increasing revolution of the Brazils, thought that he could appease the storm, by decreeing, on the 22d February, that the Infant Don Michael should proceed to Portugal in quality of Regent, and should lay before him a report of the state of the country. But what could

this feeble palliative, this succedaneum effect against a lively and irresistible impulse, like that which impelled him? This slow and indirect measure not having answered the purpose, the King, on the 24th, accepted the Constitution, made and to be made, and commandedthe Prince of the Brazils to swear to it in his name. On these events being made known at Lisbon, and the oath of the King having been presented to the Cortes, the oath was unanimously rejected; and, what is very remarkable, upon the report made by the Archbishop of Bahia. What a new spectacle for the world! An Archbishop of the Brazils causes the oath of a King of the Brazils to a European Constitution to be rejected, upon the grounds of its being contrary to the rights of the nation, and insufficient to the wants of liberty. The King offered a pure and simple acceptation; they required an absolute oath, as implying no right in the formation of the Constitution, which the Cortes attributed to themselves. They rejected, as being forms of adulation, certain titles, which it was proposed to confer upon the King, relative to the revolution. At last, on the 3d July, the King returned to Lisbon, after an absence of seventeen years, abandoning a new world in America, to come in search of a renovated one in

Europe. So vast, in our age, is the progress of the times, and so immense its operations; every Monarch is at liberty to choose his place of residence in his dominions; but on comparing the immense country of the Brazils with the confined one of Portugal, the character of King of the Brazils with that of King of Portugal, we certainly cannot accuse the King of Portugal of ambition, in giving the preference to the latter. He must now resign himself to the possession of Portugal only; for the new system of the world has re-established the order of nature, by which America had been separated from Europe. It has decreed anew, that Europe can never reign over America. It is settled, and no power in the world can alter it. Circumstances are inflexible, and incapable of subserviency.

The Envoys of Austria and of Russia have conceived themselves justified in quitting Lisbon. A correspondence has been established between them and the Portuguese Ministers, which describes the character we have brought under notice in a preceding article, that of the superiority of the revolution over its rival. Strength, reason, dignity, perspicuity, all are to be found in the Portuguese correspondence; the other has all the

harshness and all that species of haughtiness which power affects with regard to weakness. It is wanting in decision, and the only thing that can be clearly perceived is, the displeasure caused by the revolution of Portugal. Happily, the distance of the parties renders the danger of the affray trifling. How fortunate would it not be, if all those which arise in other places, did not bring on more fatal consequences.

The King had left the Prince Royal in the Brazils, in order to secure its union with Portugal. Some disturbances have taken place in that country, and it was very evident, that the departure of the King, naturally creating a suspicion that the Brazils would again become a mere province of Portugal, the effects of the discontent this suspicion was likely to give rise to, ought to have been anticipated. They were not tardy in declaring themselves and the Prince, no longer finding the means of exercising his authority, was obliged to solicit his recal. The King acquiesced, and the Cortes sanctioned it, and here a new scene opened itself, which clearly shews the alteration the world has undergone. According to the Portuguese Constitution, travelling forms one part of the education of the children of the

Royal Family. It has adopted a custom very much followed in the northern countries, where the youth of all ranks are seen availing themselves of this means of completing their education. It possesses great advantages, and Fenelon considered it the most proper for the formation of his pupil, but the adoption of this custom by the Princes of the South, formed a great contrast to that which had hitherto taken place in those countries, for their Princes were the most sequestered and most sedentary in Europe. But where the new spirit, the great boon of its Constitution, has begun to produce really precious fruits for Portugal and for the rest of Europe, is in the application given by the Cortes to the revision of its commercial relations. It might be said, that hitherto Portugal existed only for England. She was, as it were, entirely absorbed by her. It was for her that the vine flourished at Oporto, that the tree of the Hesperides burdened itself with its golden fruit, that the olive diffused its sweet and unctuous tides; it was for her that the sun of the Brazils hardened the diamond in the bowels of the earth, and it was for her that Portugal rendered her banks and her soil inhospitable to industry. One hundred and twenty years of this lucrative management, ever since the

treaty of Methuen, in 1703, had made Portugal a colony, a real English factory. Constitutional Portugal will not re-enter the general domain of Europe, from which she had been expelled by her ancient Government, who thought it convenient to abandon the profits of the country to foreigners, who protected her, on condition of excluding all others. France had supported the Portuguese in their revolution against Spain, and was supplanted by England in the Spanish succession war. Portugal will now return to the only law which accords with the system of human nature and of reason, equality among all nations; she will admit all on equal terms; all superiority being now only given to *good wares and low prices*. In future, this law will be that of the whole world, for it is that of nature and of reason. To make them prevail against custom and interest, revolutions are necessary, and receive from them their absolution. There would be none, if they were taken for guides. They every day break through the walls of separation, which ancient habits had raised between men.

In this picture of the future career of Portugal, that which Spain, on its part, has furnished, will also be found. Portugal has

been even still more restrictive, with respect to Rome and the King. Portugal, like Spain, has changed within the last fifty years. They were not only Portuguese, but Europeans, who inhabited Portugal. The constant communications with England had infused an English spirit into the country, and how would you oblige institutions to be entertained in the midst of men, who only laugh at them? Portugal has recovered her recollections as well as Spain. She has also remembered, that she was not always under an absolute Government, and that she has also been free. The slavery of Portugal dates from Philip II. This Prince treated the liberties of the Portuguese as he did those of the Spaniards, and as he wished to treat those of the Low Countries; the latter resisted, because they were at a distance from the rod of the tyrant. Twenty-two thousand heads cut off by the Duke of Alba alone, did not shake the resolution of the Dutch; but Spain and Portugal were under the thumb of Philip, and suffered him to take away what they were incapable of defending. Robertson has, with his usual sagacity, noticed the causes of the increase of royal authority, which the people emulated each other in fortifying, in order to rid themselves of the multiplied tyranny of the Barons;

they acted like the Danes, who, in their detestation of the vexatious impositions of their Barons, threw themselves, without reserve, into the arms of royalty, and freed themselves from their tyranny, by creating a despotism. All these acts speak the same language, *we prefer one master to a thousand tyrants.* Thus, despotism is one obligation more which we owe to aristocracy.

Since the revolution, the Portuguese have shewn a great desire to be reinstated in their rank among nations, and to recover their ancient honours. No feeling can be more honourable. Honour is for nations as for individuals, the first and most valuable of all property; the care of preserving it, and of rendering it useful, should form an object of attention to all Governments. Every neglect in this respect is vigorously resented by all nations. They cannot consider themselves as fields, which may be left *untilled; nations have no fallow fields;* as the improvements in agriculture have banished the former from the labours of cultivation, so, better notions of sociability will cause the latter to disappear from among the administrations of human societies.

The revolutions of Naples and Portugal have

presented the spectacle of double embassies. Some Ministers have remained at the Courts they were deputed to, and their successors have not been recognized. Some Portuguese Ministers have found themselves thus situated. The Cortes were irritated at the apparent refusal to recognize their authority. They expressed their indignation at the offending parties; and when the King's Minister endeavoured, in the sitting of the 29th July, to make some observation to palliate their conduct, he saw himself threatened with the weight of that burden, of which he was desirous to relieve the accused. It appears that the Cortes are subject to distrust; for, on receiving the King with all the honours due to his rank, they did not choose to permit the Ministers he had brought with him from the Brazils, to land at the same time. A guard was placed on board the vessel, and they were detained in *political quarantine*. It was only after some time that they obtained permission to disembark, and the most celebrated of them, the Count Palmela, received passports for a foreign country.

The Cortes, extending their views to that which is fit to increase the consideration of the national representation, have prohibited the

deputies from accepting for themselves or any one else, and from soliciting, during the term of their functions, any situation or favor which is not within the line of their legal preferment.

The laws have there done that which ought to be every where effected by the reciprocal habits of the governments and the governed; they ought to suffice for this great branch of public decency, which is so greatly injured by the contrary state. How, on the one side, could one dare to offer and on the other to accept, any place whatever, either for oneself or friends? How can we introduce into the legislative systems that, which would repel justice and the very idea of it? Independence is the principal requisite, the principal character, the principal honor of the deputy, the principal guarantee of the elector: what becomes of the independence of him who solicits, and of the security of him who has a place-hunter as his guarantee? By adding solicitations to the public functions, all system of responsibility is overturned and destroyed. It is impossible to close the gate too firmly against interest; it is so subtle, so ingenious, that it knows how to obscure this forgetfulness of the reciprocal duties of the ministers and the deputies with a

thousand pretexts. For my part it will always appear to me, that there is only one character for all, *to offer nothing, to accept nothing*; on the day on which the deputy receives the vote of the people, an insurmountable barrier ought to be raised between him and all places: every thing that passes beyond that, from that moment oversteps the line of duty and delicacy. I shall always be of opinion, that the minister who refuses every soliciting deputy, who thus covers himself with the shield of independence and strengthens it in the hands of others, will have more power than by being prodigal of the resources of the royal almanacks. These may be exhausted, but duty and honor, or in other words virtue, are alone inexhaustible and are always sure in their effect. There are some countries, in which an opposite course to that of Portugal, has been adopted, it cannot but be deeply deplored; Walpole has inflicted a deep wound on England: he has repaid the interested civilities of the place-hunters of his time with cutting words, he has marked them with the graver of history; this honest intercourse finished as it began. Robertson remarks that Lewis the XIth was the first who sowed corruption in the elections in France;* such

* Robertson's Introduction, page 85.
What his prerogative, enlarged as it was, could not furnish,

connexion ought to be sufficient to create disgust.

his address procured. He was the first monarch in Europe who discovered the method of managing those great assemblies, in which the feudal policy had vested the power of granting subsidies and of imposing taxes. He first taught other Princes the fatal art of beginning their attack on public liberty, by corrupting the source from which it should flow. By exerting all his power and address in influencing the election of representatives, by bribing or overawing the members, and by various changes which he artfully made in the form of their deliberations, Lewis acquired such entire direction over these assemblies, that, from being the vigilant guardians of the privileges and property of the people, he rendered them tamely subservient towards promoting the most odious measures of his reign.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

J. Haddon, Printer, Finsbury.

00027474

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 02 January, 2016